History of Woman Suffrage: 1876-1885

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan Brownell Anthony,
Matilda Joslyn Gage, Ida Husted Harper

Digitized by Google

ANNEX

Digitized by Google

ANNEX

ANNEX

ANNEX

SNS

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Presented by
The National American
Woman's Suffrage Association
1911.

Dup. to SNS
Be Kept

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1924 L

Digitized by Google

Phoebe W. Couzins.

Digitized by Google

HISTORY

OF

WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BY

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON,
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, AND
MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE.

ILLUSTRATED WITH STEEL ENGRAVINGS.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

1876–1885.

ENTERED ACCORDING TO ACT OF CONGRESS, IN THE YEAR 1886, BY ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, SUSAN B. ANTHONY AND MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, IN THE OFFICE OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS, AT WASHINGTON.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY,
17 MADISON ST., ROCHESTER, N. Y.

Digitized by Google

Phoebe W. Couzins.

Digitized by Google

HISTORY

[illegible]MAN SUFFRAGE.

BY

[illegible]
[illegible] AND
[illegible] GAGE.

[illegible]

[illegible]

VOL. [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] ANTHONY
[illegible] N. Y.

HISTORY

OF

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

EDITED BY

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON,
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, AND
MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE.

ILLUSTRATED WITH STEEL ENGRAVINGS.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

1876–1885.

"WOMEN ARE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES, ENTITLED TO ALL THE RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES GUARANTEED TO CITIZENS BY THE NATIONAL CONSTITUTION."

SUSAN B. ANTHONY,
17 MADISON ST., ROCHESTER, N. Y.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
745664 A
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1934 L

Copyright, 1886, by Susan B. Anthony.

Charles Mann Printing Co.,
Rochester, N. Y.

PREFACE.

THE labors of those who have edited these volumes are not only finished as far as this work extends, but if threescore years and ten be the usual limit of human life, all our earthly endeavors must end in the near future. After faithfully collecting material for several years, and making the best selections our judgment has dictated, we are painfully conscious of many imperfections the critical reader will perceive. But since stereotype plates will not reflect our growing sense of perfection, the lavish praise of friends as to the merits of these pages will have its antidote in the defects we ourselves discover. We may however without egotism express the belief that this volume will prove specially interesting in having a large number of contributors from England, France, Canada and the United States, giving personal experiences and the progress of legislation in their respective localities.

Into younger hands we must soon resign our work; but as long as health and vigor remain, we hope to publish a pamphlet report at the close of each congressional term, containing whatever may be accomplished by State and National legislation, which can be readily bound in volumes similar to these, thus keeping a full record of the prolonged battle until the final victory shall be achieved. To what extent these publications may be multiplied depends on when the day of woman's emancipation shall dawn.

For the completion of this work we are indebted to Eliza Jackson Eddy, the worthy daughter of that noble

Digitized by Google

philanthropist, Francis Jackson. He and Charles F. Hovey are the only men who have ever left a generous bequest to the woman suffrage movement. To Mrs. Eddy, who bequeathed to our cause two-thirds of her large fortune, belong all honor and praise as the first woman who has given alike her sympathy and her wealth to this momentous and far-reaching reform. This heralds a turn in the tide of benevolence, when, instead of building churches and monuments to great men, and endowing colleges for boys, women will make the education and enfranchisement of their own sex the chief object of their lives.

The three volumes now completed we leave as a precious heritage to coming generations; precious, because they so clearly illustrate—in her ability to reason, her deeds of heroism and her sublime self-sacrifice—that woman preeminently possesses the three essential elements of sovereignty as defined by Blackstone: "wisdom, goodness and power." This has been to us a work of love, written without recompense and given without price to a large circle of friends. A thousand copies have thus far been distributed among our coadjutors in the old world and the new. Another thousand have found an honored place in the leading libraries, colleges and universities of Europe and America, from which we have received numerous testimonies of their value as a standard work of reference for those who are investigating this question. Extracts from these pages are being translated into every living language, and, like so many missionaries, are bearing the glad gospel of woman's emancipation to all civilized nations.

Since the inauguration of this reform, propositions to extend the right of suffrage to women have been submitted to the popular vote in Kansas, Michigan, Colorado, Nebraska and Oregon, and lost by large majorities in all; while, by a simple act of legislature, Wyoming, Utah and Washington territories have enfranchised their women without going through the slow process of a constitutional

Digitized by Google

amendment. In New York, the State that has led this movement, and in which there has been a more continued agitation than in any other, we are now pressing on the legislature the consideration that it has the same power to extend the right of suffrage to women that it has so often exercised in enfranchising different classes of men.

Eminent publicists have long conceded this power to State legislatures as well as to congress, declaring that women as citizens of the United States have the right to vote, and that a simple enabling act is all that is needed. The constitutionality of such an act was never questioned until the legislative power was invoked for the enfranchisement of women. We who have studied our republican institutions and understand the limits of the executive, judicial and legislative branches of the government, are aware that the legislature, directly representing the people, is the primary source of power, above all courts and constitutions. Research into the early history of this country shows that in line with English precedent, women did vote in the old colonial days and in the original thirteen States of the Union. Hence we are fully awake to the fact that our struggle is not for the attainment of a new right, but for the restitution of one our fore-mothers possessed and exercised.

All thoughtful readers must close these volumes with a deeper sense of the superior dignity, self-reliance and independence that belong by nature to woman, enabling her to rise above such multifarious persecutions as she has encountered, and with persistent self-assertion to maintain her rights. In the history of the race there has been no struggle for liberty like this. Whenever the interest of the ruling classes has induced them to confer new rights on a subject class, it has been done with no effort on the part of the latter. Neither the American slave nor the English laborer demanded the right of suffrage. It was given in both cases to strengthen the liberal party. The

Digitized by Google

philanthropy of the few may have entered into those reforms, but political expediency carried both measures. Women, on the contrary, have fought their own battles; and in their rebellion against existing conditions have inaugurated the most fundamental revolution the world has ever witnessed. The magnitude and multiplicity of the changes involved make the obstacles in the way of success seem almost insurmountable.

The narrow self-interest of all classes is opposed to the sovereignty of woman. The rulers in the State are not willing to share their power with a class equal if not superior to themselves, over which they could never hope for absolute control, and whose methods of government might in many respects differ from their own. The annointed leaders in the Church are equally hostile to freedom for a sex supposed for wise purposes to have been subordinated by divine decree. The capitalist in the world of work holds the key to the trades and professions, and undermines the power of labor unions in their struggles for shorter hours and fairer wages, by substituting the cheap labor of a disfranchised class, that cannot organize its forces, thus making wife and sister rivals of husband and brother in the industries, to the detriment of both classes. Of the autocrat in the home, John Stuart Mill has well said: "No ordinary man is willing to find at his own fireside an equal in the person he calls wife." Thus society is based on this fourfold bondage of woman, making liberty and equality for her antagonistic to every organized institution. Where, then, can we rest the lever with which to lift one-half of humanity from these depths of degradation but on "that columbiad of our political life—the ballot—which makes every citizen who holds it a full-armed monitor"?

LIST OF ENGRAVINGS.

Vol. III.

Phœbe W. Couzins ..... *Frontispiece.*
Marilla M. Ricker ..... page 112
Frances E. Willard 129
Jane H. Spofford 192
Harriet H. Robinson 273
Phebe A. Hanaford 337
Armenia S. White 369
Lillie Devereux Blake 417
Rachel G. Foster 465
Cornelia C. Hussey 481
May Wright Sewall 545
Elizabeth Boynton Harbert 592
Sarah Burger Stearns 656
Clara Bewick Colby 689
Helen M. Gougar 704
Laura DeForce Gordon 753
Abigail Scott Duniway 769
Caroline E. Merrick 801
Mary B. Clay 817
Mentia Taylor 833
Priscilla Bright McLaren 864
George Sand ..... 1[illegible]6

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE CENTENNIAL YEAR—1876.

The Dawn of the New Century—Washington Convention—Congressional Hearing—Woman's Protest—May Anniversary—Centennial Parlors in Philadelphia—Letters and Delegates to Presidential Conventions—50,000 Documents sent out—The Centennial Autograph Book—The Fourth of July—Independence Square—Susan B. Anthony reads the Declaration of Rights—Convention in Dr. Furness' Church, Lucretia Mott, Presiding—The Hutchinson Family, John and Asa—The Twenty-eighth Anniversary, July 19, Edward M. Davis, Presiding—Letters, Ernestine L. Rose, Clarina I. H. Nichols—The *Ballot-Box*—Retrospect—The Woman's Pavilion 1

CHAPTER XXVIII.

NATIONAL CONVENTIONS, HEARINGS AND REPORTS.

1877–1878–1879.

Renewed Appeal for a Sixteenth Amendment—Mrs. Gage Petitions for a Removal of Political Disabilities—Ninth Washington Convention, 1877—Jane Grey Swisshelm—Letters, Robert Purvis, Wendell Phillips, Francis E. Abbott—10,000 Petitions Referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections by Special Request of the Chairman, Hon. O P. Morton, of Indiana—May Anniversary in New York—Tenth Washington Convention, 1878—Frances E. Willard and 30,000 Temperance Women Petition Congress—40,000 Petition for a Sixteenth Amendment—Hearing before the Committee on Privileges and Elections—Madam Dahlgren's Protest—Mrs. Hooker's Hearing on Washington's Birthday—Mary Clemmer's Letter to Senator Wadleigh—His Adverse Report—Thirtieth Anniversary, Unitarian Church, Rochester, N. Y., July 19, 1878—The Last Convention Attended by Lucretia Mott—Letters, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips—Church Resolution Criticised by Rev. Dr. Strong—International Women's Congress in Paris—Washington Convention, 1879—Favorable Minority Report by Senator Hoar—U. S. Supreme Court Opened to Women—May Anniversary at St. Louis—Address of Welcome by Phoebe Couzins—Women in Council Alone—Letter from Josephine Butler, of England—Mrs. Stanton's Letter to *The National Citizen and Ballot-Box* . 57

CHAPTER XXIX.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS AND CONVENTIONS.

1880–1881.

Why we Hold Conventions in Washington—Lincoln Hall Demonstration—Sixty-six Thousand Appeals—Petitions Presented in Congress—Hon. T. W. Ferry of

Digitized by Google

Michigan in the Senate—Hon. Geo. B. Loring of Massachusetts in the House—Hon. J. J. Davis of North Carolina Objected—Twelfth Washington Convention—Hearings before the Judiciary Committee of both Houses, 1880—May Anniversary at Indianapolis—Series of Western Conventions—Presidential Nominating Conventions—Delegates and Addresses to each—Mass-Meeting at Chicago—Washington Convention, 1881—Memorial Service to Lucretia Mott—Mrs. Stanton's Eulogy—Discussion in the Senate on a Standing Committee—Senator McDonald of Indiana Champions the Measure—May Anniversary in Boston—Conventions in the chief cities of New England 150

CHAPTER XXX.

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATES AND CONVENTIONS.

1882-1883.

Prolonged Discussions in the Senate on a Special Committee to Look After the Rights of Women, Messrs. Bayard, Morgan and Vest in Opposition—Mr. Hoar Champions the Measure in the Senate, Mr. Reed in the House—Washington Convention—Representative Orth and Senator Saunders on the Woman Suffrage Platform—Hearings Before Select Committees of Senate and House—Reception Given by Mrs. Spofford at the Riggs House—Philadelphia Convention—Mrs. Hannah Whitehall Smith's Dinner—Congratulations from the Central Committee of Great Britain—Majority and Minority Reports in the Senate—E. G. Lapham, J. Z. George—Nebraska Campaign—Conventions in Omaha—Joint Resolution Introduced by Hon. John D. White of Kentucky, Referred to the Select Committee—Washington Convention, January 24, 25, 26, 1883—Majority Report in the House. 198

CHAPTER XXXI.

MASSACHUSETTS.

The Woman's Hour—Lydia Maria Child Petitions Congress—First New England Convention—The New England, American and Massachusetts Associations—*Woman's Journal*—Bishop Gilbert Haven—The Centennial Tea-Party—County Societies—Concord Convention—Thirtieth Anniversary of the Worcester Convention—School Suffrage Association—Legislative Hearing—First Petitions—The Remonstrants Appear—Women in Politics—Campaign of 1872—Great Meeting in Tremont Temple—Women at the Polls—Provisions of Former State Constitutions—Petitions, 1853—School-Committee Suffrage, 1879—Women Threatened with Arrest—Changes in the Laws—Woman Now Owns her own Clothing—Harvard Annex—Woman in the Professions—Samuel E. Sewall and William I. Bowditch—Supreme-Court Decisions—Sarah E. Wall—Francis Jackson—Julia Ward Howe—Mary E. Stevens—Lucia M. Peabody—Lelia Josephine Robinson—Eliza (Jackson) Eddy's Will 265

CHAPTER XXXII.

CONNECTICUT.

Prudence Crandall—Eloquent Reformers—Petitions for Suffrage—The Committee's Report—Frances Ellen Burr—Isabella Beecher Hooker's Reminiscences—Anna Dickinson in the Republican Campaign—State Society Formed October 28, 29, 1869—Enthusiastic Convention in Hartford—Governor Marshall Jewell—He recommends More Liberal Laws for Women—Society Formed in New Haven, 1871—Governor Hubbard's Inaugural, 1877—Samuel

Digitized by Google

Bowles of the *Springfield Republican*—Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford, Chaplain, 1870—John Hooker, Esq., Champions the Suffrage Movement—The Smith Sisters—Mary Hall—Chief-Justice Park—Frances Ellen Burr—Hartford Equal Rights Club 316

CHAPTER XXXIII.

RHODE ISLAND.

Senator Anthony in *North American Review*—Convention in Providence—State Association organized, Paulina Wright Davis, President—Report of Elizabeth B. Chase—Women on School Boards—Women's Board of Visitors to the Penal and Correctional Institutions—Dr. Wm. F. Channing—Miss Ida Lewis—Letter of Frederick A. Hinckley—Last Words of Senator Anthony 339

CHAPTER XXXIV.

MAINE.

Women on School Committees—Elvira C. Thorndyke—First Suffrage Society organized, 1868, Rockland—Portland Meeting, 1870—John Neal—Judge Goddard—Colby University Open to Girls, August 12, 1871—Mrs. Clara Hapgood Nash Admitted to the Bar, October 26, 1872—Tax-Payers Protest—Ann F. Greeley, 1872—March, 1872, Bill for Woman Suffrage Lost in the House, Passed in the Senate by Seven Votes—Miss Frank Charles, Register of Deeds—Judge Reddington—Mr. Randall's Motion—Moral Eminence of Maine—Convention in Granite Hall, Augusta, January, 1873, Hon. Joshua Nye, President—Delia A. Curtis—Opinions of the Supreme Court in Regard to Women Holding Offices—Governor Dingley's Message, 1875—Convention, Representatives Hall, Portland, Judge Kingsbury, President, Feb. 12, '76—The two Snow Families—Hon. T. B. Reed 351

CHAPTER XXXV.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Nathaniel P. Rogers—Parker Pillsbury—Galen Foster—The Hutchinson Family—First Organized Action, 1868—Concord Convention—William Lloyd Garrison's Letter—Rev. S. L. Blake Opposed—Rev. Mr. Sanborn in Favor—*Concord Monitor*—Armenia S. White—A Bill to Protect the Rights of Married Men—Minority and Majority Reports—Women too Ignorant to Vote—Republican State Convention—Women on School Committees, 1870—Voting at School District Meetings, 1878—Mrs. White's Address—Mrs. Ricker on Prison Reform—Judicial Decision in Regard to Married Women, 1882—Letter from Senator Blair 367

CHAPTER XXXVI.

VERMONT.

Clarina Howard Nichols—Council of Censors—Amending the Constitution—St. Andrew's Letter—Mr. Reed's Report—Convention Called—H. B. Blackwell on the *Vermont Watchman*—Mary A. Livermore in the *Woman's Journal*—Sarah A. Gibbs' Reply to Rev. Mr. Holmes—School Suffrage, 1880 383

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXXVII.

NEW YORK—1860-1885.

Saratoga Convention, July 13, 14, 1869—State Society Formed, Martha C. Wright, President—*The Revolution* Established, 1868—Educational Movement—New York City Society, 1870, Charlotte B. Wilbour, President—Presidential Campaign, 1872—Hearings at Albany, 1873—Constitutional Commission—An Effort to Open Columbia College, President Barnard in Favor—Centennial Celebration, 1876—School Officers—Senator Emerson of Monroe, 1877—Governor Robinson's Veto—School Suffrage, 1880—Governor Cornell Recommended it in his Message—Stewart's Home for Working Women—Women as Police—An Act to Prohibit Disfranchisement—Attorney-General Russell's Adverse Opinion—The Power of the Legislature to Extend Suffrage—Great Demonstration in Chickering Hall, March 7, 1884—Hearing at Albany, 1885—Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Rogers, Mrs. Howell, Gov. Hoyt of Wyoming 395

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Carrie Burnham—The Canon and Civil Law the Source of Woman's Degradation—Women Sold with Cattle in 1768—Women Arrested in Pittsburg—Mrs. McManus—Opposition to Women in Colleges and Hospitals; John W. Forney Vindicates their Rights—Ann Preston—Women in Dentistry—James Truman's Letter—Swarthmore College—Suffrage Association Formed in 1866, in Philadelphia—John K. Wildman's Letter—Judge William S. Pierce—The Citizens' Suffrage Association, 333 Walnut Street, Edward M. Davis, President—Petitions to the Legislature—Constitutional Convention, 1873—Bishop Simpson, Mary Grew, Sarah C. Hallowell, Matilda Hindman, Mrs. Stanton, Address the Convention—Messrs. Broomall and Campbell Debate with the Opposition—Amendment Making Women Eligible to School Offices—Two Women Elected to Philadelphia School Board, 1874—The Wages of Married Women Protected—J. Edgar Thomson's Will—Literary Women as Editors—The Rev. Knox Little—Anne E. McDowell—Women as Physicians in Insane Asylums—The Fourteenth Amendment Resolution, 1881—Ex-Gov. Hoyt's Lecture on Wyoming 444

CHAPTER XXXIX.

NEW JERSEY.

Women Voted in the Early Days—Deprived of the Right by Legislative Enactment in 1807—Women Demand the Restoration of Their Rights in 1868—At the Polls in Vineland and Roseville Park—Lucy Stone Agitates the Question—State Suffrage Society Organized in 1867—Conventions—A Memorial to the Legislature—Mary F. Davis—Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford—Political Science Club—Mrs. Cornelia C. Hussey—Orange Club, 1870—Mrs. Devereux Blake gives the Oration, July 4, 1884—Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell's Letter—The Laws of New Jersey in Regard to Property and Divorce—Constitutional Commission, 1873—Trial of Rev. Isaac M. See—Women Preaching in his Pulpit—The Case Appealed—Mrs. Jones, Jailoress—Legislative Hearings . . . 476

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XL.

OHIO.

The First Soldiers' Aid Society—Mrs. Mendenhall—Cincinnati Equal Rights Association, 1868—Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital—Hon. J. M. Ashley—State Society, 1869—Murat Halstead's Letter—Dayton Convention, 1870—Women Protest Against Enfranchisement—Sarah Knowles Bolton—Statistics on Coëducation by Thomas Wentworth Higginson—Woman's Crusade, 1874—Miriam M. Cole—Ladies' Health Association—Professor Curtis—Hospital for Women and Children, 1879—Letter from J. D. Buck, M. D.—March, 1881, Degrees Conferred on Women—Toledo Association, 1869—Sarah Langdon Williams—*The Sunday Journal*—*The Ballot-Box*—Constitutional Convention—Judge Waite—Amendment Making Women Eligible to Office—Mr. Voris, Chairman Special Committee on Woman Suffrage—State Convention, 1873—Rev. Robert McCune—Centennial Celebration—Women Decline to Take Part—Correspondence—Newbury Association—Women Voting, 1871—Sophia Ober Allen—Annual Meeting, Painesville, 1885—State Society, Mrs. Frances M. Casement, President—Adelbert College . . . 491

CHAPTER XLI.

MICHIGAN.

Women's Literary Clubs and Libraries—Mrs. Lucinda H. Stone—Classes of Girls in Europe—Ernestine L. Rose—Legislative Action, 1849–1885—State Woman Suffrage Society, 1870—Annual Conventions—Northwestern Association—Wendell Phillips' Letter—Nannette Gardner votes—Catharine A. F. Stebbins Refused—Legislative Action—Amendments Submitted—An Active Canvas of the State by Women—Election Day—The Amendment Lost, 40,000 Men Voted in Favor—University at Ann Arbor Opened to Girls, 1869—Kalamazoo Institute—J. A. B. Stone—Miss Madeline Stockwell and Miss Sarah Burger Applied for Admission to the University in 1857—Episcopal Church Bill—Local Societies—Quincy—Lansing—St. Johns—Manistee—Grand Rapids—Sojourner Truth—Laura C. Haviland—Sybil Lawrence 513

CHAPTER XLII.

INDIANA.

The First Woman Suffrage Convention After the War, 1869—Amanda M. Way—Annual Meetings, 1870–85, in the Larger Cities—Indianapolis Equal Suffrage Society, 1878—A Course of Lectures—In May, 1880, National Convention in Indianapolis—Zerelda G. Wallace—Social Entertainment—Governor Albert G. Porter—Susan B. Anthony's Birthday—Schuyler Colfax—Legislative Hearings—Temperance Women of Indiana—Helen M. Gougar—General Assembly—Delegates to Political Conventions—Women Address Political Meetings—Important Changes in the Laws for Women, from 1860 to 1884—Colleges Open to Women—Demia Butler—Professors—Lawyers—Doctors—Ministers—Miss Catharine Merrill—Miss Elizabeth Eaglesfield—Rev. Prudence Le Clerc—Dr. Mary F. Thomas—Prominent Men and Women—George W. Julian—The Journals—Gertrude Garrison 533

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XLIII.

ILLINOIS.

Chicago a Great Commercial Centre—First Woman Suffrage Agitation, 1855—A. J. Grover—Society at Earlville—Prudence Crandall—Sanitary Movement—Woman in Journalism—Myra Bradwell—Excitement in Elmwood Church, 1868—Mrs. Huldah Joy—Pulpit Utterances—Convention, 1869, Library Hall, Chicago—Anna Dickinson, Robert Laird Collier Debate—Manhood Suffrage Denounced by Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony—Judge Charles B. Waite on the Constitutional Convention—Hearing before the Legislature—Western Suffrage Convention, Mrs. Livermore, President—Annual Meeting at Bloomington—Women Eligible to School Offices—Evanston College—Miss Alta Hulett Medical Association—Dr. Sarah Hackett Stevenson—"Woman's Kingdom" in the *Inter-Ocean*—Mrs. Harbert—Centennial Celebration at Evanston—Temperance Petition, 180,000—Frances E. Willard—Social Science Association—Art Union—Jane Graham Jones at International Congress in Paris—Moline Association 559

CHAPTER XLIV.

MISSOURI.

Missouri the first State to Open Colleges of Law and Medicine to Woman—Liberal Legislation—Harriet Hosmer—Wayman Crow—Dr. Joseph N. McDowell—Works of Art—Women in the War—Adeline Couzins—Virginia L. Minor—Petitions—Woman Suffrage Association, May 8, 1867—First Woman Suffrage Convention, Oct. 6, 1869—Able Resolutions by Francis Minor—Action Asked for in the Methodist Church—Constitutional Convention—Mrs. Hazard's Report—National Suffrage Association, 1879—Virginia L. Minor Before the Committee on Constitutional Amendments—Mrs. Minor Tries to Vote—Her Case in the Supreme Court—Mrs. Annie R. Irvine—"Oregon Woman's Union"—Miss Phœbe Couzins Graduates From the Law School, 1871—Reception by Members of the Bar—Speeches—Dr. Walker—Judge Krum—Hon. Albert Todd—Ex-Governor E. O. Stanard—Ex-Senator Henderson—Judge Reber—George M. Stewart—Mrs. Minor—Miss Couzins 594

CHAPTER XLV.

IOWA.

Beautiful Scenery—Liberal in Politics and Reforms—Legislation for Women—No Right yet to Joint Earnings—Early Agitation—Frances Dana Gage, 1854—Mrs. Amelia Bloomer Lectures in Council Bluffs, 1856—Mrs. Martha H. Brinkerhoff—Mrs. Annie Savery, 1868—County Associations Formed in 1869—State Society Organized at Mt. Pleasant, 1870, Henry O'Connor, President—Mrs. Cutler Answers Judge Palmer—First Annual Meeting, Des Moines—Letter from Bishop Simpson—The State Register Complimentary—Mass-Meeting at the Capitol—Mrs. Savery and Mrs. Harbert—Legislative Action—Methodist and Universalist Churches Indorse Woman Suffrage—Republican Plank, 1874—Governor Carpenter's Message, 1876—Annual Meeting, 1882, Many Clergymen Present—Five Hundred Editors Interviewed—Miss Hindman and Mrs. Campbell—Mrs. Callanan Interviews Governor Sherman, 1884—Lawyers—Governor Kirkwood Appoints Women to Office—County Superintendents—Elizabeth S. Cook—Journalism—Literature—Medicine—Ministry—Inventions—President of a National Bank—The Heroic Kate Shelly—Temperance—Improvement in the Laws 612

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XLVI.

WISCONSIN.

Progressive Legislation—The Rights of Married Women—The Constitution Shows Four Classes Having the Right to Vote—Woman Suffrage Agitation—C. L. Sholes' Minority Report, 1856—Judge David Noggle and J. T. Mills' Minority Report, 1859—State Association Formed, 1869—Milwaukee Convention—Dr. Laura Ross—Hearing Before the Legislature—Convention in Janesville, 1870—State University—Elizabeth R. Wentworth—Suffrage Amendment, 1880, '81, '82—Rev. Olympia Brown, Racine, 1877—Madam Anneké—Judge Ryan—Three Days' Convention at Racine, 1883—Eveleen L. Mason—Dr. Sarah Munro—Rev. Dr. Corwin—Lavinia Godell, Lawyer—Angie King—Kate Kane 638

CHAPTER XLVII.

MINNESOTA.

Girls in State University—Sarah Burger Stearns—Harriet E. Bishop, the First Teacher in St. Paul—Mary J. Colburn Won the Prize—Mrs. Jane Grey Swisshelm, St. Cloud—Fourth of July Oration, 1866—First Legislative Hearing, 1867—Governor Austin's Veto—First Society at Rochester—Kasson—Almira W. Anthony—Mary P. Wheeler—Harriet M. White—The W. C. T. U.—Harriet A. Hobart—Literary and Art Clubs—School Suffrage, 1876—Charlotte O. Van Cleve and Mrs. C. S. Winchell Elected to School Board—Mrs. Governor Pillsbury—Temperance Vote, 1877—Property Rights of Married Women—Women as Officers, Teachers, Editors, Ministers, Doctors, Lawyers. 649

CHAPTER XLVIII.

DAKOTA.

Influences of Climate and Scenery—Legislative Action, 1872—Mrs. Marietta Bones—In February, 1879, School Suffrage Granted Women—Constitutional Convention, 1883—Matilda Joslyn Gage Addressed a Letter to the Convention and an Appeal to the Women of the State—Mrs. Bones Addressed the Convention in Person—The Effort to get the Word "Male" out of the Constitution Failed—Legislature of 1885—Major Pickler Presents the Bill—Carried Through Both Houses—Governor Pierce's Veto—Major Pickler's Letter. 662

CHAPTER XLIX.

NEBRASKA.

Clara Bewick Colby—Nebraska Came into the Possession of the United States, 1803—The Home of the Dakotas—Organized as a Territory, 1854—Territorial Legislature—Mrs. Amelia Bloomer Addresses the House—Gen. Wm. Larimer, 1856—A Bill to Confer Suffrage on Women—Passed the House—Lost in the Senate—Constitution Harmonized with the Fourteenth Amendment—Admitted as a State March 1, 1867—Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony Lecture in the State, 1867—Mrs. Tracy Cutler, 1870—Mrs. Esther L. Warner's Letter—Constitutional Convention, 1871—Woman Suffrage Amendment Submitted—Lost by 12,676 against, 3,502 for—Prolonged Discussion—Constitutional Convention, 1875—Grasshoppers Devastate the Country—*Inter-Ocean*, Mrs. Harbert—Omaha *Republican*, 1876—Woman's Column Edited by Mrs. Harriet S.

Digitized by Google

Brooks—"Woman's Kingdom"—State Society Formed, January 19, 1881, Mrs. Brooks President—Mrs. Dinsmoor, Mrs. Colby, Mrs. Brooks, before the Legislature—Amendment again Submitted—Active Canvass of the State, 1882—First Convention of the State Association—Charles F. Manderson—Unreliable Politicians—An Unfair Count of Votes for Woman Suffrage—Amendment Defeated—Conventions in Omaha—Notable Women in the State—Conventions—*Woman's Tribune* Established in 1883 670

CHAPTER L.

KANSAS.

Effect of the Popular Vote on Woman Suffrage—Anna C. Wait—Hannah Wilson—Miss Kate Stephens, Professor of Greek in State University—Lincoln Centre Society, 1879—The Press—The Lincoln *Beacon*—Election, 1880—Sarah A. Brown, Democratic Candidate—Fourth of July Celebration—Women Voting on the School Question—State Society, 1884—Helen M. Gougar—Clara Bewick Colby—Bertha H. Ellsworth—Radical Reform Association—Mrs. A. G. Lord—Prudence Crandall—Clarina Howard Nichols—Laws—Women in the Professions—Schools—Political Parties—Petitions to the Legislature—Col. F. G. Adams' Letter 696

CHAPTER LI.

COLORADO.

Great American Desert—Organized as a Territory, February 28, 1860—Gov. McCook's Message Recommending Woman Suffrage, 1870—Adverse Legislation—Hon. Amos Steck—Admitted to the Union, 1876—Constitutional Convention—Efforts to Strike Out the Word "Male"—Convention to Discuss Woman Suffrage—School Suffrage Accorded—State Association Formed, Alida C. Avery, President—Proposition for Full Suffrage Submitted to the Popular Vote—A Vigorous Campaign—Mrs. Campbell and Mrs. Patterson of Denver—Opposition by the Clergy—Their Arguments Ably Answered—D. M. Richards—The Amendment Lost—*The Rocky Mountain News* 712

CHAPTER LII.

WYOMING.

The Dawn of the New Day, December, 1869—The Goal Reached in England and America—Territory Organized, May, 1869—Legislative Action—Bill for Woman Suffrage—William H. Bright—Gov. Campbell Signs the Bill—Appoints Esther Morris, Justice of the Peace, March, 1870—Women on the Jury, Chief-Justice Howe, Presiding—J. W. Kingman, Associate-Justice, Addresses the Jury—Women Promptly Take Their Places—Sunday Laws Enforced—Comments of the Press—Judge Howe's Letter—Laramie *Sentinel*—J. H. Hayford—Women Voting, 1870—Grandma Swain the First to Cast her Ballot—Effort to Repeal the Law, 1871—Gov. Campbell's Veto—Mr. Corlett—Rapid Growth of Public Opinion in Favor of Woman Suffrage 726

CHAPTER LIII.

CALIFORNIA.

Liberal Provisions in the Constitution—Elizabeth T. Schenck—Eliza W. Farnham—Mrs. Mills' Seminary, now a State Institution—Jeannie Carr, State Super-

Digitized by Google

intendent of Schools—First Awakening—*The Revolution*—Anna Dickinson—Mrs. Gordon Addresses the Legislature, 1868—Mrs. Pitts Stevens Edits *The Pioneer*—First Suffrage Society on the Pacific Coast, 1869—State Convention, January 26, 1870, Mrs. Wallis, President—State Association Formed, Mrs. Haskell of Petaluma, President—Mrs. Gordon Nominated for Senator—In 1871, Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony Visit California—Hon. A. A. Sargent Speaks in Favor of Suffrage for Women—Ellen Clark Sargent Active in the Movement—Legislation Making Women Eligible to Hold School Offices, 1873—July 10, 1873, State Society Incorporated, Sarah Wallis, President—Mrs. Clara Foltz—A Bill Giving Women the Right to Practice Law—The Bill Passed and Signed by the Governor—Contest Over Admitting Women into the Law Department of the University—Supreme Court Decision Favorable—Hon. A. A. Sargent on the Constitution and Laws—Journalists and Printers Silk Culture—Legislative Appropriation—Mrs. Knox Goodrich Celebrates July 4, 1876—Imposing Demonstration—Ladies in the Procession 749

CHAPTER LIV.

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST.

The Long Marches Westward—Abigail Scott Duniway—Mary Olney Brown—The First Steps in Oregon—Col. C. A. Reed—Judge G. W. Lawson—1870—The New Northwest, 1871—Campaign, Mrs. Duniway and Miss Anthony—They Address the Legislature in Washington Territory—Hon. Elwood Evans—Suffrage Societies Organized at Olympia and Portland—Before the Oregon Legislature—Donation Land Act—Hon. Samuel Corwin's Suffrage Bill—Married Woman's *Sole* Traders' Bill—Temperance Alliance—Women Rejected—Major Williams Fights Their Battles and Triumphs—Mrs. H. A. Loughary—Progressive Legislation, 1874—Mob-Law in Jacksonville, 1879—Dr. Mary A. Thompson—Constitutional Convention, 1878—Woman Suffrage Bill, 1880—Hon. W. C. Fulton—Women Enfranchised in Washington Territory, Nov. 15, 1883—Great Rejoicing, Bonfires, Ratification Meetings—Constitutional Amendment Submitted in Oregon and Lost, June, 1884—Suffrage by Legislative Enactment Lost—Fourth of July Celebrated at Vancouvers—Benjamin and Mary Olney Brown—Washington Territory—Legislation in 1867-68 Favorable to Women—Mrs. Brown Attempts to Vote and is Refused—Charlotte Olney French—Women Vote at Grand Mound and Black River Precincts, 1870—Retrogressive Legislation, 1871—Abby H. Stuart in Land-Office—Hon. William H. White—Idaho and Montana 767

CHAPTER LV.

LOUISIANA—TEXAS—ARKANSAS—MISSISSIPPI.

St. Anna's Asylum, Managed by Women—Constitutional Convention, 1879—Women Petition—Clara Merrick Guthrie—Petition Referred to Committee on Suffrage—A Hearing Granted—Mrs. Keating—Mrs. Saxon—Mrs. Merrick—Col. John M. Sandige—Efforts of the Women all in Vain—Action in 1885—Gov. McEnery—The *Daily Picayune*—Women as Members of the School Board—Physiology in the Schools—Miss Eliza Rudolph—Mrs. E. J. Nicholson—Judge Merrick's Digest of Laws—Texas—Arkansas—Mississippi—Sarah A. Dorsey 789

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LV. (CONTINUED).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MARYLAND—DELAWARE—KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE—VIRGINIA—WEST VIRGINIA—NORTH CAROLINA—SOUTH CAROLINA—FLORIDA—ALABAMA—GEORGIA.

Secretary Chase—Women in the Government Departments—Myrtilla Miner—Mrs. O'Connor's Tribute—District of Columbia Suffrage Bill—The Universal Franchise Association, 1867—Bill for a Prohibitory Law Presented by Hon. S. C. Pomeroy, 1869—A Bill for Equal Wages for the Women in the Departments, Introduced by Hon. S. M. Arnell, 1870—In 1871 Congress Passed the Organic Act for the District Confining the Right of Suffrage to Males—In 1875 it Withdrew all Legislative Power from the People—Women in Law, Medicine, Journalism and the Charities—Dental College Opened to Women—Mary A. Stewart—The Clay Sisters—The School of Pharmacy—Elizabeth Avery Meriwether—Judge Underwood—Mary Bayard Clarke—Dr. Susan Dimock—Governor Chamberlain—Coffee-Growing—Priscilla Holmes Drake—Alexander H. Stephens 808

CHAPTER LV. (CONCLUDED).

CANADA.

Miss Phelps of St. Catharines—The Revolt of the Thirteen Colonies—First Parliament—Property Rights of Married Women—School Suffrage Thirty Years—Municipal Suffrage, 1882, 1884—Women Voting in Toronto, 1886—Mrs. Curzon—Dr. Emily H. Stone—Woman's Literary Club of Toronto—Nova Scotia—New Brunswick—Miss Harriet Stewart 831

CHAPTER LVI.

GREAT BRITAIN.

Women Send Members to Parliament—Sidney Smith, Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden—The Ladies of Oldham—Jeremy Bentham—Anne Knight—Northern Reform Society, 1858—Mrs. Matilda Biggs—Unmarried Women and Widows Petition Parliament—Associations Formed in London, Manchester, Edinburgh, 1867—John Stuart Mill in Parliament—Seventy-three Votes for his Bill—John Bright's Vote—Women Register and Vote—Lord-Chief-Justice of England Declares their Constitutional Right—The Courts Give Adverse Decisions—Jacob Bright Secures the Municipal Franchise—First Public Meeting—Division on Jacob Bright's Bill to Remove Political Disabilities—Mr. Gladstone's Speech—Work of 1871-72—Fourth Vote on the Suffrage Bill—Jacob Bright Fails of Reëlection—Efforts of Mr. Forsyth—Memorial of the National Society—Some Account of the Workers—Vote of the New Parliament, 1875—Organized Opposition—Diminished Adverse Vote of 1878—Mr. Courtney's Resolution—Letters—Great Demonstrations at Manchester—London—Bristol—Nottingham—Birmingham—Sheffield—Glasgow—Victory in the Isle of Man—Passage of the Municipal Franchise Bill for Scotland—Mr. Mason's Resolution—Reduction of Adverse Majority to 16—Liberal Conference at Leeds—Mr. Woodall's Amendment to Reform Bill of 1884—Meeting at Edinburgh—Other Meetings—Estimated Number of Women Householders—Circulars to Members of Parliament—Debate on the Amendment—Resolutions of the Society—Further Debate—Defeat of the Amendment—Meeting at St. James Hall—Conclusion 833

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LVII.

CONTINENTAL EUROPE.

The Woman Question in the Back-ground—In France the Agitation Dates from the Upheaval of 1789—International Women's Rights Convention in Paris, 1878—Mlle. Hubertine Auclert Leads the Demand for Suffrage—Agitation Began in Italy with the Kingdom—Concepcion Arenal in Spain—Coëducation in Portugal—Germany: Leipsic and Berlin—Austria in Advance of Germany Caroline Svetlá of Bohemia—Austria Unsurpassed in Contradictions—Marriage Emancipates from Tutelage in Hungary—Dr. Henrietta Jacobs of Holland—Dr. Isala Van Diest of Belgium—In Switzerland the Catholic Cantons Lag Behind—Marie Gœgg, the Leader—Sweden Stands First—Universities Open to Women in Norway—Associations in Denmark—Liberality of Russia toward Women—Poland—The Orient—Turkey—Jewish Wives—The Greek Woman in Turkey—The Greek Woman in Greece—An Unique Episode—Woman's Rights in the American Sense not Known 895

CHAPTER LVIII.

REMINISCENCES.

BY E. C. S. 922

Appendix 955

Digitized by Google

Editor's copy

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE CENTENNIAL YEAR—1876.

The Dawn of the New Century—Washington Convention—Congressional Hearing—Woman's Protest—May Anniversary—Centennial Parlors in Philadelphia—Letters and Delegates to Presidential Conventions—50,000 Documents sent out—The Centennial Autograph Book—The Fourth of July—Independence Square—Susan B. Anthony reads the Declaration of Rights—Convention in Dr. Furness' Church, Lucretia Mott, Presiding—The Hutchinson Family, John and Asa—The Twenty-eighth Anniversary, July 19, Edward M. Davis, Presiding—Letters, Ernestine L. Rose, Clarina I. H. Nichols—The *Ballot-Box*—Retrospect—The Woman's Pavilion.

DURING the sessions of 1871–72 congress enacted laws providing for the celebration of the one-hundredth anniversary of American independence, to be held July 4, 1876, in Philadelphia, the historic city from whence was issued the famous declaration of 1776.

The first act provided for the appointment by the president of a "Centennial Commission," consisting of two members from each State and territory in the Union; the second incorporated the Centennial Board of Finance and provided for the issue of stock to the amount of $10,000,000, in 1,000,000 shares of $10 each. It was at first proposed to distribute the stock among the people of the different States and territories according to the ratio of their population, but subscriptions were afterward received without regard to States. The stockholders organized a board of directors, April 1, 1873. The design of the exhibition was to make it a comprehensive display of the industrial, intellectual and moral progress of the nation during the first century of its existence; but by the earnest invitation of our government foreign nations so generally participated that it was truly, as its name implied, an "International and World's Exposition."

The centennial year opened amid the wildest rejoicing. In honor of the nation's birthday extensive preparations were made for the great event. Crowds of people eager to participate in the celebration, everywhere flocked from the adjacent country to

Digitized by Google

the nearest village or city, filling the streets and adding to the general gala look, all through the day and evening of December 31, 1875. From early gas-light upon every side the blowing of horns, throwing of torpedos, explosion of fire-crackers, gave premonition of more enthusiastic exultation. As the clock struck twelve every house suddenly blossomed with red, white and blue; public and private buildings burst into a blaze of light that rivaled the noon-day sun, while screaming whistles, booming cannon, pealing bells, joyous music and brilliant fire-works made the midnight which ushered in the centennial 1876, a never-to-be-forgotten hour.

Portraits of the presidents from Washington and Lincoln laurel-crowned, to Grant, sword in hand, met the eye on every side. Stars in flames of fire lighted the foreign flags of welcome to other nations. Every window, door and roof-top was filled with gay and joyous people. Carriages laden with men, women and children in holiday attire enthusiastically waving the national flag and singing its songs of freedom. Battalions of soldiers marched through the streets; Roman candles, whizzing rockets, and gaily-colored balloons shot upward, filling the sky with trails of fire and adding to the brilliancy of the scene, while all minor sounds were drowned in the martial music. Thus did the old world and the new commemorate the birth of a nation founded on the principle of self-government.

The prolonged preparations for the centennial celebration naturally roused the women of the nation to new thought as to their status as citizens of a republic, as well as to their rightful share in the progress of the century. The oft-repeated declarations of the fathers had a deeper significance for those who realized the degradation of disfranchisement, and they queried with each other as to what part, with becoming self-respect, they could take in the coming festivities.* Woman's achievements in art, science and industry would necessarily be recognized in

*Some suggested that the women in their various towns and cities, draped in black, should march in solemn procession, bells slowly tolling, bearing banners with the inscriptions: "Taxation without representation is tyranny," "No just government can be formed without the consent of the governed," "They who have no voice in the laws and rulers are in a condition of slavery."

Others suggested that instead of women wearing crape during the centennial glorification, the men should sit down in sackcloth and ashes, in humiliation of spirit, as those who repented in olden times were wont to do. The best centennial celebration, said they, for the men of the United States, the one to cover them with glory, would be to extend to the women of the nation all the rights, privileges and immunities that they themselves enjoy.

Others proposed that women should monopolize the day, have their own celebrations, read their own declarations and protests demanding justice, liberty and equality. The latter suggestion was extensively adopted, and the Fourth of July, 1876, was remarkable for the large number of women who were "the orators of the day" in their respective localities.

the Exposition; but with the dawn of a new era, after a hundred years of education in a republic, she asked more than a simple recognition of the products of her hand and brain; with her growing intelligence, virtue and patriotism, she demanded the higher ideal of womanhood that should welcome her as an equal factor in government, with all the rights and honors of citizenship fully accorded. During the entire century, women who understood the genius of free institutions had ever and anon made their indignant protests in both public and private before State legislatures, congressional committees and statesmen at their own firesides; and now, after discussing the right of self-government so exhaustively in the late anti-slavery conflict, it seemed to them that the time had come to make some application of these principles to the women of the nation. Hence it was with a deeper sense of injustice than ever before that the National Suffrage Association issued the call for the annual Washington Convention of 1876:

CALL FOR THE EIGHTH ANNUAL WASHINGTON CONVENTION.—The National Woman Suffrage Association will hold its Eighth Annual Convention in Tallmadge Hall, Washington, D. C., January 27, 28, 1876. In this one-hundredth year of the Republic, the women of the United States will once more assemble under the shadow of the national capitol to press their claims to self-government.

That property has its rights, was acknowledged in England long before the revolutionary war, and this recognized right made "no taxation without representation" the most effective battle-cry of that period. But the question of property representation fades from view beside the greater question of the right of each individual, millionaire or pauper, to personal representation. In the progress of the war our fathers grew in wisdom, and the Declaration of Independence was the first national assertion of the right of individual representation. That "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," thenceforward became the watchword of the world. Our flag, which beckons the emigrant from every foreign shore, means to him self-government.

But while in theory our government recognizes the rights of all people, in practice it is far behind the Declaration of Independence and the national constitution. On what just ground is discrimination made between men and women? Why should women, more than men, be governed without their own consent? Why should women, more than men, be denied trial by a jury of their peers? On what authority are women taxed while unrepresented? By what right do men declare themselves invested with power to legislate for women? For the discussion of these vital questions friends are invited to take part in the convention.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *President*, Fayetteville, N. Y.
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Ch'n Ex. Com.*, Rochester, N. Y.

At the opening session of this convention the president, Matilda Joslyn Gage, said:

I would remind you, fellow-citizens, that this is our first convention in the dawn of the new century. In 1776 we inaugurated our experiment of self-government. Unbelief in man's capacity to govern himself was freely expressed by every European monarchy except France. When John Adams was Minister to England, the newspapers of that country were filled with prophecies that the new-born republic would soon gladly return to British allegiance. But these hundred years have taught them the worth of liberty; the Declaration of Independence has become the alphabet of nations; Europe, Asia, Africa, South America and the isles of the sea, will unite this year to do our nation honor. Our flag is everywhere on sea and land. It has searched the North Pole, explored every desert, upheld religious liberty of every faith and protected political refugees from every nation, but it has not yet secured equal rights to women.

This year is to be one of general discussion upon the science of government; its origin, its powers, its history. If our present declaration cannot be so interpreted as to cover the rights of women, we must issue one that will. I have received letters from many of the Western States and from this District, urging us to prepare a woman's declaration, and to celebrate the coming Fourth of July with our own chosen orators and in our own way. I notice a general awakening among women at this time. But a day or two since the women of this District demanded suffrage for themselves in a petition of 25,000 names. The men are quiet under their disfranchisement, making no attempt for their rights—fit slaves of a powerful ring.

The following protest was presented by Mrs. Gage, adopted by the convention, printed and extensively circulated:

To the Political Sovereigns of the United States in Independence Hall assembled:

We, the undersigned women of the United States, asserting our faith in the principles of the Declaration of Independence and in the constitution of the United States, proclaiming it as the best form of government in the world, declare ourselves a part of the people of the nation unjustly deprived of the guaranteed and reserved rights belonging to citizens of the United States; because we have never given our consent to this government; because we have never delegated our rights to others; because this government is false to its underlying principles; because it has refused to one-half its citizens the only means of self-government—the ballot; because it has been deaf to our appeals, our petitions and our prayers;

Therefore, in presence of the assembled nations of all the world, we protest against this government of the United States as an oligarchy of sex, and not a true republic; and we protest against calling this a centennial celebration of the independence of the people of the United States.

Letters* were read and a series of resolutions were discussed and adopted:

Resolved, That the demand for woman suffrage is but the next step in the great movement which began with *Magna Charta*, and which has ever since tended toward vesting government in the whole body of the people.

Resolved, That we demand of the forty-fourth congress, in order that it may adequately celebrate the centennial year, the admission to the polls of the women of all the territories, and a submission to the legislatures of the several States of an amendment securing to women the elective franchise.

Resolved, That the enfranchisement of women means wiser and truer wedlock, purer and happier homes, healthier and better children, and strikes, as nothing else does, at the very roots of pauperism and crime.

Resolved, That if Colorado would come into the Union in a befitting manner for the celebration of the centennial of the Declaration of Independence, she should give the ballot to brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, and thus present to the nation a truly free State.

Resolved, That the right of suffrage being vested in the women of Utah by their constitutional and lawful enfranchisement, and by six years of use, we denounce the proposition about to be again presented to congress for the disfranchisement of the women in that territory, as an outrage on the freedom of thousands of legal voters and a gross innovation of vested rights; we demand the abolition of the system of numbering the ballots, in order that the women may be thoroughly free to vote as they choose, without supervision or dictation, and that the chair appoint a committee of three persons, with power to add to their number, to memorialize congress, and otherwise to watch over the rights of the women of Utah in this regard during the next twelve months.

BELVA A. LOCKWOOD presented the annual report: The question of woman suffrage is to be submitted to the people of Iowa during the present centennial year, if this legislature ratifies the action of the previous one. Colorado has not embodied the word "male" in her constitution, and a vigorous effort is being made to introduce woman suffrage there. In Minnesota women are allowed to vote on school questions and to hold office by a recent constitutional amendment. In Michigan, in 1874, the vote for woman suffrage was 40,000, about 1,000 more votes than were polled for the new constitution. The Connecticut legislature, during the past year appointed a committee to consider and report the expediency of making women eligible to the position of electors for president and vice-president. The committee made a unanimous report in its favor, and secured for its passage 82 votes, while 101 votes were cast against it. In Massachusetts, Governor Rice, in his inaugural address, recommended to the legislature to secure to women the right to vote for presidential electors. An address to the legislature of New York by Mesdames Gage, Blake and Lozier upon this question, was favorably received and extensively quoted by the press. At an agricultural fair in Illinois the Hon. James R. Doolittle advocated household suffrage. In the Senate of the thirteenth legislature of the State of Texas, Senator Dohoney, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, made a report strongly advocating woman suffrage; and in 1875, when a mem-

*Letters were read from the Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia; William J. Fowler, of Rochester, N. Y.; Isabella Beecher Hooker, of Connecticut, and Susan B. Anthony.

Digitized by Google

ber of the Constitutional Convention, he advocated the same doctrine, and was ably assisted by Hon. W. G. L. Weaver. The governor of that State, in his message, recommended that women school teachers should receive equal pay for equal work. The word "male" does not occur in the new constitution. In the territories of Wyoming and Utah, woman suffrage still continues after five years' experiment, and we have not learned that households have been broken up or that babies have ceased to be rocked.

Women physicians, women journalists and women editors have come to be a feature of our institutions. Laura De Force Gordon, a member of our association, is editing a popular daily—the *Leader*—in Sacramento, Cal. Women are now admitted to the bar in Kansas, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, Utah, Wyoming and the District of Columbia. They are eligible and are serving as school superintendents in Kansas, Nebraska, Illinois, Iowa and Wisconsin. Illinois allows them to be notaries public. As postmasters they have proved competent, and one woman, Miss Ada Sweet, is pension agent at Chicago. Julia K. Sutherland has been appointed commissioner of deeds for the State of California. In England women vote on the same terms as men on municipal, parochial and educational matters. In Holland, Austria and Sweden, women vote on a property qualification. The Peruvian Minister of Justice has declared that Peru places women on the same footing as men. Thus all over the world is the idea of human rights taking root and cropping out in a healthful rather than a spasmodic outgrowth.

The grand-daughter of Paley, true to her ancestral blood, has excelled all the young men in Cambridge in moral science. Julia J. Thomas, of Cornell University, daughter of Dr. Mary F. Thomas, of Indiana, in the recent inter-collegiate contest, took the first prize of $300, over eight male competitors, in Greek. The recent decision in the United States Supreme Court, of Minor *vs.* Happersett, will have as much force in suppressing the individuality and self-assertion of women as had the opinion of Judge Taney, in the Dred-Scott case, in suppressing the emancipation of slavery. The day has come when precedents are made rather than blindly followed. The refusal of the Superior Court of Philadelphia to allow Carrie S. Burnham to practice law, because there was no precedent, was a weak evasion of common law and common sense. One hundred years ago there was no precedent for a man practicing law in the State of Pennsylvania, and yet we have not learned that there was any difficulty in establishing a precedent. I do not now remember any precedent for the Declaration of Independence of the United Colonies, and yet during a century it has not been overturned. The rebellion of the South had no precedent, and yet, if I remember, there was an issue joined, and the United States found that she had jurisdiction of the case.

The admission of women to Cornell University; their reception on equal footing in Syracuse University, receiving in both equal honorary degrees; the establishment of Wellesley College, with full professorships and capable women to fill them; the agitation of the question in Washington of the establishment of a university for women, all show a mental awaken-

Digitized by Google

ing in the popular mind not hitherto known. A new era is opening in the history of the world. The seed sown twenty-five years ago by Mrs. Stanton and other brave women is bearing fruit.

SARA ANDREWS SPENCER said it was interesting to pair off the objections and let them answer each other like paradoxes. Women will be influenced by their husbands and will vote for bad men to please them. Women have too much influence now, and if we give them any more latitude they will make men all vote their way. Owing to the composition and structure of the female brain, women are incapable of understanding political affairs. If women are allowed to vote they will crowd all the men out of office, and men will be obliged to stay at home and take care of the children. That is, owing to the composition and structure of the female brain, women are so exactly adapted to political affairs that men wouldn't stand any chance if women were allowed to enter into competition with them. Women don't want it. Women shouldn't have it, for they don't know how to use it. Grace Greenwood (who was one of the seventy-two women who tried to vote) said men were like the stingy boy at school with a cake. "Now," said he, "all you that don't ask for it don't want it, and all you that do ask for it sha'n't have it."

Rev. OLYMPIA BROWN, pastor of the Universalist church in Bridgeport, Conn., gave her views on the rights of women under the constitution, and believed that they were entitled to the ballot as an inalienable right. In this country, under existing rulings of the courts as to the meaning of the constitution, no one appeared likely to enjoy the ballot for all time except the colored men, unless the clause, "previous condition of servitude," as a congressman expressed it, referred to widows. That being true, the constitution paid a premium only on colored men, and widows. If the constitution did not guarantee suffrage, and congress did not bestow it, then the republic was of no account and its boast devoid of significance and meaning. Its life had been in vain—dead to the interests for which it was created. She wanted congress to pass a sixteenth amendment, declaring all its citizens enfranchised, or a declaratory act setting forth that the constitution already guaranteed to them that right.

Hon. FREDERICK DOUGLASS said he was not quite in accord with all the sentiments that had been uttered during the afternoon, yet he was willing that the largest latitude should be taken by the advocates of the cause. He was not afraid that at some distant period the blacks of the South would rise and disfranchise the whites. While he was not willing to be addressed as the ignorant, besotted creature that the negro is sometimes called, he was willing to be a part of the bridge over which women should march to the full enjoyment of their rights.

Miss PHŒBE COUZINS of St. Louis reviewed in an able manner the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Virginia L. Minor.

Mrs. DEVEREUX BLAKE spoke on the rights and duties of citizenship. She cited a number of authorities, including a recent decision of the Supreme Court, to prove that women are citizens, although deprived of the privileges of citizenship. Taking up the three duties of citizenship—paying taxes, serving on jury, and military service—she said

woman had done her share of the first for a hundred years; that the women of the country now contributed, directly and indirectly, one-third of its revenues, and that the House of Representatives had just robbed them of $500,000 to pay for a centennial celebration in which they had no part. As for serving on jury, they did not claim that as a privilege, as it was usually regarded as a most disagreeable duty; but they did claim the right of women, when arraigned in court, to be tried by a jury of their peers, which was not accorded when the jury was composed wholly of men. Lastly, as to serving their country in time of war, it was a fact that women had actually enlisted and fought in our late war, until their sex was discovered, when they were summarily dismissed without being paid for their services.

Hon. Aaron A. Sargent, of California, in the United States Senate, and Hon. Samuel S. Cox, of New York, in the House of Representatives, presented the memorial asking the enfranchisement of the women of the District of Columbia, as follows:

IN THE SENATE, Tuesday, January 25, 1876.

Mr. SARGENT: I present a memorial asking for the establishment of a government in the District of Columbia which shall secure to its women the right to vote. This petition is signed by many eminent ladies of the country: Mrs. Matilda Joslyn Gage, President of the National Woman Suffrage Association, and the following officers of that society: Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Henrietta Payne Westbrook, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Mathilde F. Wendt, Ellen Clark Sargent; also by Mary F. Foster, President of the District of Columbia Woman's Franchise Association; Susan A. Edson, M. D.; Mrs. E. D. E. N. Southworth, the distinguished authoress; Mrs. Dr. Caroline B. Winslow; Belva A. Lockwood, a practicing lawyer in this District; Sara Andrews Spencer, and Mrs. A. E. Wood.

These intelligent ladies set forth their petition in language and with facts and arguments which I think should meet the ear of the Senate, and I ask that it be read by the secretary in order that their desires may be known.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* Is there objection? The chair hears none, and the secretary will report the petition. The secretary read:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has affirmed the decision of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in the cases of Spencer *vs.* The Board of Registration, and Webster *vs.* The Judges of Election, and has decided that "by the operation of the first section of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, women have been advanced to full citizenship and clothed with the capacity to become voters; and further, that this first section of the fourteenth amendment does not execute itself, but requires the supervision of legislative power in the exercise of legislative discretion to give it effect"; and whereas the congress of the United States is the legislative body having exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, and in enfranchising the colored men and refusing to enfranchise women, white or colored, made an unjust discrimination against sex, and did not give the in-

telligence and moral power of the citizens of said District a fair opportunity for expression at the polls; and whereas woman suffrage is not an experiment, but has had a fair trial in Wyoming, where women hold office, where they vote, where they have the most orderly society of any of the territories, where the experiment is approved by the executive officers of the United States, by their courts, by their press and by the people generally, and where it has "rescued that territory from a state of comparative lawlessness" and rendered it "one of the most orderly in the Union"; and whereas upon the woman suffrage amendment to Senate bill number 44 of the second session of the forty-third congress, votes were recorded in favor of woman suffrage by the two senators from Indiana, the two from Florida, the two from Michigan, the two from Rhode Island, one from Kansas, one from Louisiana, one from Massachusetts, one from Minnesota, one from Nebraska, one from Nevada, one from Oregon, one from South Carolina, one from Texas, and one from Wisconsin; and whereas a fair trial of equal suffrage for men and women in the District of Columbia, under the immediate supervision of congress, would demonstrate to the people of the whole country that justice to women is policy for men; and whereas the women of the United States are governed without their own consent, are denied trial by a jury of their peers, are taxed without representation, and are subject to manifold wrongs resulting from unjust and arbitrary exercise of power over an unrepresented class; and whereas in this centennial year of the republic the spirit of 1776 is breathing its influence upon the people, melting away prejudices and animosities and infusing into our national councils a finer sense of justice and a clearer perception of individual rights; therefore,

We pray your honorable body to establish a government for the District of Columbia which shall secure to its women the right to vote.

Mr. SARGENT: Even if this document were not accompanied by the signatures of eminent ladies known throughout the land for their virtues, intelligence and high character, the considerations which it presents would be worthy of the attention of the senate. I have no doubt that the great movement of which this is a part will prevail. It is working its progress day by day throughout the country. It is making itself felt both in social and political life. The petitioners here well say that there has been a successful experiment of the exercise of female suffrage in one of our territories; that a territory has been redeemed from lawlessness; that the judges, the press, the people generally of Wyoming approve the results of this great experiment. I know of no better place than the capital of a nation where a more decisive trial can be made, if such is needed, to establish the expediency of woman suffrage. As to its justice, who shall deny it? I ask, for the purpose of due consideration, that this petition be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, so that in preparing any scheme for the government of the District which is likely to come before this congress, due weight may be given to the considerations presented.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The petition will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Friday, March 31, 1876.

Mr. COX: Mr. Speaker, I am requested to present a memorial, asking for a form of government in the District of Columbia which shall secure to its women the right to vote; and I ask the grace and favor to have this memorial printed in the *Record.*

Digitized by Google

Mr. BANKS: Mr. Speaker, I beg the privilege of saying a few words in favor of the request made by the gentleman from New York who presents this memorial. It is a hundred years this day since Mrs. Abigail Adams, of Massachusetts, wrote to her husband, John Adams, then a member of the continental convention, entreating him to give to women the power to protect their own rights and predicting a general revolution if justice was denied them. Mrs. Adams was one of the noblest women of that period, distinguished by heroism and patriotism never surpassed in any age. She was wife of the second and mother of the sixth president of the United States, and her beneficent influence was felt in political as well as in social circles. It was perhaps the first demand for the recognition of the rights of her sex made in this country, and is one of the centennial incidents that should be remembered. It came from a good quarter. This memorial represents half a million of American women. They ask for the organization of a government in the District of Columbia that will recognize their political rights. I voted some years ago to give women the right to vote in this District, and recalling the course of its government I think it would have done no harm if they had enjoyed political rights.

Mr. KASSON: I suggest that the memorial be printed without the names.

Mr. COX: There are no names appended except those of the officers of the National Woman Suffrage Association; and I hope they will be printed with the memorial.

Mr. HENDEE: I trust the gentleman will allow this petition to be referred to the committee of which I am a member: the Committee for the District of Columbia. There being no objection, the memorial was read and referred to the Committee for the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the *Record.*

At the close of the convention a hearing was granted to the ladies before the committees of the Senate and House of Representatives on the District of Columbia.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, of New York, said: *Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee:* On behalf of the National Association, which has its officers in every State and territory of the Union, and which numbers many thousands of members, and on behalf of the Woman's Franchise Association of the District of Columbia, we appear before you, asking that the right of suffrage be secured equally to the men and women of this District. Art. I, sec. 8, clauses 17, 18 of the Constitution of the United States reads:

> Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district as may become the seat of government of the United States, * * * * * to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

Congress is therefore constitutionally the special guardian of the rights of the people of the District of Columbia. It possesses peculiar rights, peculiar duties, peculiar powers in regard to this District. At the present time the men and women are alike disfranchised. Our memorial asks that in forming a new government they may be alike enfranchised. It is

often said as an argument against granting suffrage to women that they do not wish to vote; do not ask for the ballot. This association, numbering thousands in the United States, through its representatives, now asks you, in this memorial, for suffrage in this District. Petitions from every State in the Union have been sent to your honorable body. One of these, signed by thirty-five thousand women, was sent to congress in one large roll; but what is the value of a petition signed by even a million of an unrepresented class?

The city papers of the national capital, once bitterly opposed to all effort in this direction, now fully recognize the dignity of the demand, and have ceased to oppose it. One of these said, editorially, to-day, that the vast audiences assembling at our conventions, the large majority being women, and evidently in sympathy with the movement, were proof of the great interest women take in this subject, though many are too timid to openly make the demand. The woman's temperance movement began two years ago as a crusade of prayer and song, and the women engaged therein have now resolved themselves into a national organization, whose second convention, held in October last, numbering delegates from twenty-two States, almost unanimously passed a resolution demanding the ballot to aid them in their temperance work. We who make our constant demand for suffrage, knew that these women were in process of education, and would soon be forced to ask for the key to all reform.

The ballot says yes or no to all questions. Without it women are prohibited from practically expressing their opinions. The very fact that the women of this District make this demand of you more urgently than men proves that they desire it more and see its uses better. The men of this District who quietly remain disfranchised have the spirit of slaves, and if asking for the ballot is any proof of fitness for its use, then the women who do ask for it here prove themselves in this respect superior to men, more alive to the interests of this District, and better fitted to administer the government. Women who are not interested in questions of reform would soon become so if they possessed the ballot. They are now in the condition we were when we heard of the famine in Persia two years ago. Our sympathies were aroused for a brief while, but Persia was far away, we could render it no certain aid, and the sufferings of the people soon passed from our minds.

Our approaching centennial celebration is to commemorate the Declaration of Independence, which was based on individual rights. For ages it was a question where the governing power rightfully belonged; patriarch, priest, and monarch each claimed it by divine right. Our country declared it vested in the individual. Not only was this clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence, but the same ground was maintained in the secret proceedings upon framing the constitution. The old confederation was abandoned because it did not secure the independence and safety of the people. It has recently been asked in congressional debates, "What is the grand idea of the centennial?" The answer was, "It is the illustration in spirit and truth of the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the constitution."

These principles are:

First—The natural rights of each individual.

Second—The exact equality of these rights.

Third—That rights not delegated are retained by the individual.

Fourth—That no person shall exercise the rights of others without delegated authority.

Fifth—That non-use of rights does not destroy them.

Rights did not come new-born into the world with the revolution. Our fathers were men of middle age before they understood their own rights, but when they did they compelled the recognition of the world, and now the nations of the earth are this year invited to join you in the celebration of these principles of free government.

We have special reasons for asking you to secure suffrage to the women of the District of Columbia. Woman Suffrage has been tried in Wyoming, and ample testimony of its beneficial results has been furnished, but it is a far distant territory, and those not especially interested will not examine the evidence. It has been tried in Utah, but with great opposition on account of the peculiar religious belief and customs of the people. But the District of Columbia is directly under the eye of congress. It is the capital of the nation, and three-fifths of the property of the District belongs to the United States. The people of the whole country would therefore be interested in observing the practical workings of this system on national soil. With 7,316 more women than men in this District, we call your special attention to the inconsistency and injustice of granting suffrage to a minority and withholding it from a majority, as you have done in the past. If the District is your special ward, then women, being in the majority here, have peculiar claims upon you for a consideration of their rights. The freedom of this country is only half won. The women of to-day have less freedom than our fathers of the revolution, for they were permitted local self-government, while women have no share in local, State, or general government.

Our memorial calls your attention to the Pembina debate in 1874, when senators from eighteen States recognized the right of self-government as inhering in women. One senator said: "I believe women never will enjoy equality with men in taking care of themselves until they have the right to vote." Another, "that the question was being considered by a large portion of the people of the United States." When the discussion was concluded and the vote taken, twenty-two senators recorded their votes for woman suffrage in that distant territory. During the debate several senators publicly declared their intention of voting for woman suffrage in the District of Columbia whenever the opportunity was presented. These senators recognize the fact that the ballot is not only a right, but that it is opportunity for woman; that it is the one means of helping her to help herself. In asking you to secure the ballot to the women of the District we do not ask you to create a right. That is beyond your power. We ask you to protect them in the exercise of a right.

Mrs. Sara Andrews Spencer, Secretary of the District of Columbia Woman's Franchise Association, said: For no legal or political right I

have ever claimed in the District of Columbia do I ask a stronger, clearer charter than the Declaration of Independence, and the constitution of the United States as it stood before the fourteenth amendment had entered the minds of men. A judicial decision, rendered by nine men, upon the rights of ten millions of women of this republic, need not, does not, change the convictions of one woman in regard to her own heaven-endowed rights, duties, and responsibilities.

We have resorted to all the measures dictated by those who rule over us for securing the freedom to exercise rights which are sacredly our own, rights which are ours by Divine inheritance, and which men can neither confer nor take away. We are not only daughters of our Father in heaven, and joint heirs with you there; but we are daughters of this republic, and joint heirs with you here. Every act of legislation which has been placed as a bar in our way as citizens has been an act of injustice, and every expedient to which we have resorted for securing recognition of citizenship has been with protest against the existence of these acts of unauthorized power.

When any man expresses doubt to me as to the use that I or any other woman might make of the ballot if we had it, my answer is, What is that to you? If you have for years defrauded me of my rightful inheritance, and then, as a stroke of policy, or from late conviction, concluded to restore to me my own domain, must I ask you whether I may make of it a garden of flowers, or a field of wheat, or a pasture for kine? If I choose I may counsel with you. If experience has given you wisdom, even of this world, in managing your property and mine, I should be wise to learn from you. But injustice is not wont to yield wisdom; grapes do not grow of thorns, nor figs of thistles.

Born of the unjust and cruel subjection of woman to man, we have in these United States a harvest of 116,000 paupers, 36,000 criminals, and such a mighty host of blind, deaf and dumb, idiotic, insane, feeble-minded, and children with tendencies to crime, as almost to lead one to hope for the extinction of the human race rather than for its perpetuation after its own kind. The wisdom of man licenses the dram-shop, and then rears station-houses, jails, and gibbets to provide for the victims. In this District we have 135 teachers of public schools and 238 police officers, and the last report shows that public safety demands a police force of 900. We have 31,671 children of school age; 31,671 reasons why I want to vote. We have here 7,000 more children of school age than there are seats in all the public schools, and from the swarm of poor, ignorant, and vagrant children, the lists of criminals and paupers are constantly supplied. To provide for these evils there is an annual expenditure of $350,000, not including expenses of courts, while for education the annual expenditure is $280,000.

Will you say that the wives and the mothers, the house and homekeepers of this small territory, have no interest in all these things? If dram-shops are licensed and brothels protected, are not our sons, our brothers, tempted and ruined, our daughters lured from their homes, and lost to earth and heaven? Long and patiently women have borne wrongs too deep to be

Digitized by Google

put into words; wrongs for which men have provided no redress and have found no remedy. When five years ago, with our social atmosphere poisoned with vices which as women we had no power to remove, men in authority began a series of attempts to fasten upon us by law the huge typical vice of all the ages—the social evil—in a form so degrading to all womanhood that no man, though he were the prince of profligates, would submit to its regulations for a day; then we cried out so that the world heard us. We know the plague is only stayed for a brief while. The hydra-headed monster every now and then lifts a new front, and must be smitten again. Four times in four successive years a little company of women of the District have appeared before committees and compelled the discussion and defeat of bills designed to fasten these measures upon the community under the guise of security for public health and morality. The last annual report of the board of health speaks tenderly of the need of protecting vicious men by these regulations, and says:

> The legalization of houses of ill-fame for so humane a purpose, startling as it may be to the moral sense, has many powerful advocates among the thoughtful, wise, and philanthropic of communities.

The report quotes approvingly Dr. Gross, of Philadelphia, who says in behalf of laws to license the social evil:

> The prejudices which surround the subject must be swept away, and men must march to the front and discharge their duty, however much they may be reproached and abused by the ignorant and foolish.

Aside from the higher ground of our inherent right to self-government, we declare here and now that the women of this District are not safe without the ballot. Our firesides, our liberties are in constant peril, while men who have no concern for our welfare may legislate against our dearest interests. If we would inaugurate any measure of protection for our own sex, we are bound hand and foot by man. The law is his, the treasury is his, the power is his, and he need not even hear our cry, except at his good will and pleasure.

If man had legislated justly and wisely for the interests of this District, if its financial condition was sound, its social and moral atmosphere pure, and all was well, there would be some show of reason in your refusing to hazard a new experiment, even though we could demonstrate it to be founded upon eternal justice. But the history of the successive forms of government in the District of Columbia is a history of failures. So will it continue to be until you adopt a plan founded upon truly republican principles. When, a few years ago, you put the ballot into the hands of the swarming masses of freedmen who had gathered here with the ignorance and vices of slaves, and refused to enfranchise women, white or colored, you gave this District no fair trial of a republican form of government. You did not even protect the interests of the colored race. You admitted that the colored man was not really free until he held the ballot in his hand, and therefore you enfranchised him and left the woman twice his slave. I know colored women in Washington far the superiors, intellectually and morally, of the masses of men, who declare that they now endure wrongs and abuses unknown in slavery.

There is not an interest in this District that is not as vital to me as to any man in Washington—that is not more vital to me than it can be to any member of this honorable body. As a citizen, seeking the welfare of this community, as a wife and mother desiring the safety of my children, which of you can claim a deeper interest than I in questions of markets, taxes, finance, banks, railroads, highways, the public debt and interest thereon, boards of health, sanitary and police regulations, station-houses (wherein I find many a wreck of womanhood, ruined in her youth and beauty), schools, asylums, and charities? Why deny me a voice in any or all of these? Do you doubt that I would use the ballot in the interests of order, retrenchment, and reform? Do you deny a right of mine, which you will admit I know how to prize, because there are women who do not appreciate its value, do not demand it, possibly might not (any better than men) know how to use it? What a mockery of justice! What a flagrant violation of individual rights! I would cry out against it if no other woman in the land felt the wrong. But among the 10,000,000 of mothers of 14,000,000 of children in this country, vast numbers of thoughtful, philanthropic, and pure women have come to see this truth, and desire to express their mother love and home love at the ballot-box!

Frederick Douglass once said: "Whole nations have been bathed in blood to establish the simplest possible propositions. For instance, that a man's head is *his* head; his body is *his* body; his feet are *his* feet, and if he chooses to run away with them it is nobody's business"; and all honor to him, he added, "Now, these propositions have been established for the colored man. Why does not man establish them for woman, his wife, his mother?"

Determined to surround the colored man with every possible guarantee of protection in the possesion of his freedom, congress stopped the wheels of legislation, and made the whole country wait, while day after day and night after night his friends fought inch by inch the ground for the civil rights bill. During that debate Senator Frelinghuysen said:

When I took the oath as senator, I took the oath to support the Constitution of the United States, which declares equality for all: and in advocating this bill I am doing my sworn duty in endeavoring to secure equal rights for every citizen of the United States.

But where slept his "sworn duty" when he recorded his vote in the Senate against woman suffrage? With marvelous inconsistency, as a reason for opposing woman suffrage, during the Pembina debate, May 27, 1874, Senator Merrimon said of the relation of women to the Constitution of the United States:

They have sustained it under all circumstances with their love, their hands, and their hearts; with their smiles and their tears they have educated their children to live for it, and to die for it.

Therefore the honorable gentleman denies them the right to vote.

Upon the civil rights bill, Senator Howe said:

I do not know but what the passage of this bill will break up the common schools. I admit that I have some fear on that point. Every step of this terrible march has been met with a threat; but let justice be done although the common schools and the heavens do fall.

In reply to the point made by Mr. Stockton that the people of the United States would not accept this bill, Mr. Howe said:

I would not turn back if I knew that of the forty million people of the United States not one million would sustain it. If this generation does not accept it there is a generation to come that will accept it. What does this provide? Not that the black man should be helped on his way; not at all; but only that, as he staggers along, he shall not be retarded, shall not be tripped up and made to fall.

Brave and tender words these for our black brother; but see how prone men are to invert truth, justice, and mercy in dealing with women. During the Pembina debate, Senator Merrimon said:

I know there are a few women in the country who complain; but those who complain, compared with those who do not complain, are as one to a million.

As a literal fact, the women who have complained, have petitioned, sued, reasoned, plead, have knocked at the doors of your legislatures and courts, are as one to fifty in this country, as we who watch the record know; and even that is a small proportion of those who would, but dare not; who are bound hand and foot, and will be bound until you make them free. But if no others feel the wrong but those who have dared to complain; if the poor, the ignorant, the betrayed, the ruined do not understand the question, and the well-fed and comfortable "have all the rights they want," do you give that for answer to our just demand? What do we ask? Not that poor woman "shall be helped on her way"—not at all; but only that, "as she staggers along, she shall not be retarded, shall not be tripped up, shall not be made to fall."

And here on this national soil, for the women of this District of Columbia—your peculiar wards—I ask you to try the experiment of exact, even-handed justice; to give us a voice in the laws under which we must live, by which we are tried, judged and condemned. I ask it for myself, that I may the better help other women. I ask it for other women, that they may the better help themselves. As you hope for justice and mercy in your hour of need, may you hear and answer.

Rev. Olympia Brown, of Connecticut; Belva A. Lockwood, of Washington; and Phoebe Couzins, of St. Louis, also addressed the committees: enforcing their arguments with wit, humor, pathos and eloquence.

On her way home from Washington, Mrs. Gage stopped in Philadelphia to secure rooms for the National Association during the centennial summer, and decided upon Carpenter Hall, in case it could be obtained. This hall belongs to the Carpenter Company of Philadelphia, perhaps the oldest existing association of that city, it having maintained an uninterrupted organization from the year 1724, about forty years after the establishment of the colonial government by William Penn, and was much in use during the early days of the revolution. The doors of the State House,

where the continental congress intended to meet, were found closed against it; but the Carpenter Company, numbering many eminent patriots, offered its hall for their use; and here met the first continental congress, September 5, 1774. John Adams, describing its opening ceremonies, said:

Here was a scene worthy of the painter's art. Washington was kneeling there, and Randolph, Rutledge, Lee and Jay; and by their side there stood, bowed in reverence, the Puritan patriots of New England, who at that moment had reason to believe that an armed soldiery was wasting their humble households. It was believed that Boston had been bombarded and destroyed.* They prayed fervently for America, for the congress, for the province of Massachusetts Bay, and especially for the town of Boston. Who can realize the emotions with which in that hour of danger they turned imploringly to heaven for Divine interposition. It was enough to melt a heart of stone. I saw the tears gush into the eyes of old, gray, pacific Quakers of Philadelphia.

The action of this congress, which sat but seven weeks, was momentous in the history of the world. "From the moment of their first debate," said De Tocqueville, "Europe was moved." The convention which in 1781 framed the constitution of the United States, also met in Carpenter Hall in secret session for four months before agreeing upon its provisions. This hall seemed the most appropriate place for establishing the centennial rooms of the National Woman Suffrage Association, but the effort to obtain it proved unavailing † as will be seen by the following correspondence:

To the President and Officers of the Carpenter Company of Philadelphia:

The National Woman Suffrage Association will hold its headquarters in Philadelphia the centennial season of 1876, and desires to secure your historic hall for that purpose. We know your habit and custom of denying its use to all societies, yet we make our request because our objects are in accord with the principles which emanated from within its walls a hundred years ago, and we shall use it in carrying out those principles of liberty and equality upon which our government is based.

We design to advertise our headquarters to the world, and old Carpenter Hall, if used by us, would become more widely celebrated as the birth-place of liberty. Our work in it would cause it to be more than ever held in reverence by future ages, and pilgrimages by men and women would be made to it as to another Mecca shrine.

We propose to place a person in charge, with pamphlets, speeches, tracts, etc., and to hold public meetings for the enunciation of our principles and the furtherance of our demands. Hoping you will grant this request,

I am respectfully yours, MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE,
President of the National Woman Suffrage Association.

* News of the cannonade of Boston had been received the day previous.

† Though thus discourteously refused to an association to secure equality of rights for women, it was subsequently rented to "The International Peace Association."

Two months afterward, the following reply was received:

HALL, CARPENTER COURT, 322 Chestnut St.,
PHILADELPHIA, April 24, 1876.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *President of the Woman Suffrage Association:*

Your communication asking permission to occupy Carpenter Hall for your convention was duly received, and presented to the company at a stated meeting held the 16th instant, when on motion it was unanimously resolved to postpone the subject indefinitely.

[Extract of minutes]. GEORGE WATSON, *Secretary.*

It was a matter of no moment to those men that women were soon to assemble in Philadelphia, whose love of liberty was as deep, whose patriotism was as pure as that of the fathers who met within its walls in 1774, and whose deliberations had given that hall its historic interest.

In the midst of these preparations the usual May anniversary was held:

CALL FOR THE MAY ANNIVERSARY, 1876.—The National Woman Suffrage Association will hold its Ninth Annual Convention in Masonic Hall, New York, corner of Sixth avenue and Twenty-third street, May 10, 11, 1876.

This convention occuring in the centennial year of the republic, will be a most important one. The underlying principles of government will this year be discussed as never before; both foreigners and citizens will query as to how closely this country has lived up to its own principles. The long-debated question as to the source of the governing power was answered a century ago by the famous Declaration of Independence which shook to the foundation all recognized power and proclaimed the right of the individual as above all forms of government; but while thus declaring itself, it has held the women of the nation accountable to laws they have had no share in making, and taught as their one duty, that doctrine of tyrants, unquestioning obedience. Liberty to-day is, therefore, but the heritage of one-half the people, and the centennial will be but the celebration of the independence of one-half the nation. The men alone of this country live in a republic, the women enter the second hundred years of national life as political slaves.

That no structure is stronger than its weakest point is a law of mechanics that will apply equally to government. In so far as this government has denied justice to woman, it is weak, and preparing for its own downfall. All the insurrections, rebellions, and martyrdoms of history have grown out of the desire for liberty, and in woman's heart this desire is as strong as in man's. At every vital time in the nation's life, men and women have worked together; everywhere has woman stood by the side of father, brother, husband, son, in defense of liberty; without her aid the republic could never have been established; and yet women are still suffering under all the oppressions complained of in 1776; which can only be remedied by securing impartial suffrage to all citizens without distinction of sex.

All persons who believe republican principles should be carried out in spirit and in truth, are invited to be present at the May convention.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *President.*

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Chairman Executive Committee.*

This May anniversary, commencing on the same day with the opening of the centennial exhibition, was marked with more than usual earnestness. As popular thought naturally turned with increasing interest at such an hour to the underlying principles

Digitized by Google

of government, woman's demand for political equality received a new impulse. The famous Smith sisters, of Glastonbury, Connecticut, attended this convention, and were most cordially welcomed. The officers* for the centennial year were chosen and a campaign† and congressional‡ committee appointed to take charge of affairs at Philadelphia and Washington. The resolutions show the general drift of the discussions:§

WHEREAS, The right of self-government inheres in the individual before governments are founded, constitutions framed, or courts created; and

WHEREAS, Governments exist to protect the people in the enjoyment of their natural rights, and when any government becomes destructive of this end, it is the right of the people to resist and abolish it; and

WHEREAS, The women of the United States, for one hundred years, have been denied the exercise of their natural right of self-government and self-protection; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the natural right and most sacred duty of the women of these United States to rebel against the injustice, usurpation and tyranny of our present government.

WHEREAS, The men of 1776 rebelled against a government which did not claim to be of the people, but, on the contrary, upheld the "divine right of kings"; and

WHEREAS, The women of this nation to-day, under a government which claims to be based upon individual rights, to be "of the people, by the people, and for the people," in an infinitely greater degree are suffering all the wrongs which led to the war of the revolution; and

---

**President*—Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Tenafly, New Jersey.

Vice-Presidents—Lucretia Mott, Pa.; Ernestine L. Rose, England; Paulina Wright Davis, R. I.; Clarina I. H. Nichols, Cal.; Amelia Bloomer, Iowa; Mathilde Franceska Anneke, Wis.; Virginia L. Minor, Mo.; Catharine A. F. Stebbins, Mich.; Julia and Abby Smith, Conn.; Abby P. Ela, N. H.; Mrs. W. H. H. Murray, Mass.; Ann T. Greely, Me.; Eliza D. Stewart, Ohio; Mary Hamilton Williams, Ind.; Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Ill.; Sarah Burger Stearns, Minn.; Ada W. Lucas, Neb.; Helen E. Starrett, Kan.; Ann L. Quinby, Ky; Elizabeth Avery Meriwether, Tenn.; Mrs. L. C. Locke, Texas; Emily P. Collins, La.; Mary J. Spaulding, Ga.; Mrs. P. Holmes Drake, Ala.; Flora M. Wright, Fla.; Frances Annie Pillsbury, S. C.; Cynthia Anthony, N. C.; Carrie F. Putnam, Va.; Anna Ella Carroll, Md.; Abigail Scott Duniway, Oregon; Hannah H. Clapp, Nevada; Dr. Alida C. Avery, Col.; Mary Olney Brown, Wash. Ter.; Esther A. Morris, Wyoming Ter.; Annie Godbe, Utah.

Advisory Committee—Sarah Pugh, Pa.; Isabella Beecher Hooker, Conn.; Charlotte B. Wilbour, N. Y.; Mary J. Channing, R. I.; Elizabeth B. Schenck, Cal.; Judith Ellen Foster, Iowa; Lavinia Goodell, Wis.; Annie R. Irvine, Mo.; Marian Bliss, Mich.; Mary B. Moses, N. H.; Sarah A. Vibbart, Mass.; Lucy A. Snowe, Me.; Marilla M. Ricker, N. H.; Mary Madden, Ohio; Emma Molloy, Ind.; Cynthia A. Leonard, Ill.; Mrs. Dr. Stewart, Minn.; Julia Brown Bemis, Neb.; Mrs. N. H. Cramer, Tenn.; Mrs. W. V. Tunstall, Tex.; Mrs. A. Millspaugh, La.; Hannah M. Rogers, Fla.; Sally Holly, Va.; Sallie W. Hardcastle, Md.; Mary P. Sautelle, Oregon; Mary F. Shields, Col.; Amelia Giddings, Wash. Ter.; Amalia B. Post, Wyoming Ter.

Corresponding Secretaries—Susan B. Anthony, Rochester, N. Y.; Laura Curtis Bullard, New York; Jane Graham Jones, Chicago, Ill.

Recording Secretary—Lillie Devereux Blake, New York.

Treasurer—Ellen Clark Sargent, Washington, D. C.

Executive Committee—Matilda Joslyn Gage, Fayetteville, N. Y.; Clemence S. Lozier, M. D., Elizabeth B. Phelps, Mathilde F. Wendt, Phebe H. Jones, New York; Rev. Olympia Brown, Connecticut; Sarah R. L. Williams, Ohio; M. Adeline Thomson, Pennsylvania; Henrietta Payne Westbrook, Pennsylvania; Nancy R. Allen, Iowa.

†*1876 Campaign Committee*—Susan B. Anthony, N. Y.; Matilda Joslyn Gage, N. Y.; Phoebe W. Couzins, Mo.; Rev. Olympia Brown, Conn.; Jane Graham Jones, Ill.; Abigail Scott Duniway, Oregon; Laura De Force Gordon, Cal.; Annie C. Savery, Iowa.

‡*Resident Congressional Committee*—Sara Andrews Spencer, Ellen Clark Sargent, Ruth Carr Denison, Belva A. Lockwood, Mrs. E. D. E. N. Southworth.

§Among those who took part in the discussions were Dr Clemence Lozier, Susan B. Anthony, Helen M. Slocum, Sarah Goodyear, Helen M. Cook, Abby and Julia Smith, Sara Andrews Spencer, Mrs Charlotte Ray, Lillie Devereux Blake and Matilda Joslyn Gage.

WHEREAS, The oppression is all the more keenly felt because our masters, instead of dwelling in a foreign land, are our husbands, our fathers, our brothers and our sons; therefore,

Resolved, That the women of this nation, in 1876, have greater cause for discontent, rebellion and revolution, than the men of 1776.

Resolved, That with Abigail Adams, in 1776, we believe that "the passion for liberty cannot be strong in the breasts of those who are accustomed to deprive their fellow-creatures of liberty"; that, as Abigail Adams predicted, "We are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by laws in which we have no voice or representation."

WHEREAS, We believe in the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States, and believe a true republic is the best form of government in the world; and

WHEREAS, This government is false to its underlying principles in denying to women the only means of self-government, the ballot; and

WHEREAS, One-half of the citizens of this nation, after a century of boasted liberty, are still political slaves; therefore,

Resolved, That we protest against calling the present centennial celebration a celebration of the independence of the people of the United States.

Resolved, That we meet in our respective towns and districts on the Fourth of July, 1876, and declare ourselves no longer bound to obey laws in whose making we have had no voice, and, in presence of the assembled nations of the world gathered on this soil to celebrate our nation's centennial, demand justice for the women of this land.

WHEREAS, The men of this nation have established for men of all nations, races and color, on this soil, at the cost of countless lives, the proposition (in the language of Frederick Douglass) "that a man's head is his head, his body is his body, his feet are his feet"; therefore,

Resolved, That justice, equity and chivalry demand that man at once establish for his wife and mother the corresponding proposition, that a woman's head is her head, her body is her body, her feet are her feet, and that all ownership and mastery over her person, property, conscience, and liberty of speech and action, are in violation of the supreme law of the land.

Resolved, That we rejoice in the resistance of Julia and Abby Smith, Abby Kelly Foster, Sarah E. Wall and many more resolute women in various parts of the country, to taxation without representation.

Resolved, That the thanks of the National Woman Suffrage Association are hereby tendered to Hon. A. A. Sargent, of California, for his earnest words in behalf of woman suffrage on the floor of the United States Senate, Jan. 25, 1876; and to Hon. N. P. Banks, of Massachusetts, for his appeal in behalf of the centennial woman suffrage memorial in the United States House of Representatives, March 31, 1876.

Resolved, That the repeated attempts to license the social evil are a practical confession of the weakness, profligacy and general unfitness of men to legislate for women, and should be regarded with alarm as a proof that their firesides and liberties are in constant peril while men alone make and execute the laws of this country.

WHEREAS, There are 7,000 more women than men in the District of Columbia, and no form of government for said District has allowed women any voice in making the laws under which they live; therefore,

Resolved, That in this centennial year the congress of the United States having exclusive jurisdiction over that territory should establish a truly republican form of government by granting equal suffrage to the men and women of the District of Columbia.

Immediately at the close of the May convention Mrs. Gage again went to Philadelphia to complete the arrangements in regard to the centennial headquarters. Large and convenient

rooms were soon found upon Arch street, terms agreed upon and a lease drawn, when it transpired that a husband's consent and signature must be obtained, although the property was owned by a woman, as by the laws of Pennsylvania a married woman's property is under her husband's control. Although arrangements for this room had been made with the real owner, the terms being perfectly satisfactory to her, the husband refused his ratification, tearing up the lease, with abuse of the women who claimed control of their own property, and a general defiance of all women who dared work for the enfranchisement of their sex. Thus again were women refused rooms in Philadelphia in which to enter their protest against the tyranny of this republic, and for the same reason—they were slaves. Had the patriots of the revolutionary period asked rooms of King George, in which to foster their treason to his government, the refusal could have been no more positive than in these cases.

The quarters finally obtained were very desirable; fine large parlors on the first floor, on Chestnut street, at the fashionable west end, directly opposite the Young Men's Christian Association. The other members of the committee being married ladies, Miss Anthony, as a *feme sole*, was alone held capable of making a contract, and was therefore obliged to assume the pecuniary responsibility of the rooms. Thus it is ever the married women who are more especially classed with lunatics, idiots and criminals, and held incapable of managing their own business. It has always been part of the code of slavery, that the slave had no right to property; all his earnings and gifts belonging by law, to the master. Married women come under this same civil code. The following letter was extensively circulated and published in all the leading journals:

NATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE PARLORS,
1,431 Chestnut Street, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The National Woman Suffrage Association has established its centennial headquarters in Philadelphia, at 1,431 Chestnut street. The parlors, in charge of the officers of the association, are devoted to the special work of the year, pertaining to the centennial celebration and the political party conventions; also to calls, receptions, conversazioni, etc. On the table a centennial autograph book receives the names of visitors. Friends at a distance, both men and women, who cannot call, are invited to send their names, with date and residence, accompanied by a short expressive sentiment and a contribution toward expenses. In the rooms are books, papers, reports and decisions, speeches, tracts, and photographs of distinguished women; also mottoes and pictures expressive of woman's

condition. In addition to the parlor gatherings, meetings and conventions will be held during the season in various halls and churches throughout the city.

On July Fourth, while the men of this nation and the world are rejoicing that "All men are free and equal" in the United States, a declaration of rights for women will be issued from these headquarters, and a protest against calling this centennial a celebration of the independence of the people, while one-half are still political slaves.

Let the women of the whole land, on that day, in meetings, in parlors, in kitchens, wherever they may be, unite with us in this declaration and protest. And, immediately thereafter, send full reports, in manuscript or print, of their resolutions, speeches and action, for record in our centennial book, that the world may see that the women of 1876 know and feel their political degradation no less than did the men of 1776.

The first woman's rights convention the world ever knew, called by Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, met at Seneca Falls, N. Y., July 19, 20, 1848. In commemoration of the twenty-eighth anniversary of that event, the National Woman Suffrage Association will hold in ——— hall, Philadelphia, July 19, 20, of the present year, a grand mass convention, in which eminent reformers from the new and old world will take part. Friends are especially invited to be present on this historic occasion.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Chairman Executive Committee.*
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Corresponding Secretary.*

From these headquarters numberless documents were issued during the month of June. As the presidential nominating conventions were soon to meet, letters were addressed to both the Republican and Democratic parties, urging them to recognize the political rights of women in their platforms. Thousands of copies of these letters were scattered throughout the nation:

To the President and Members of the National Republican Convention, Cincinnati, O., June 14, 1876.

GENTLEMEN: The National Woman Suffrage Association asks you to place in your platform the following plank:

Resolved. That the right to the use of the ballot inheres in every citizen of the United States; and we pledge ourselves to secure the exercise of this right to all citizens, irrespective of sex.

In asking the insertion of this plank, we propose no change of fundamental principles. Our question is as old as the nation. Our government was framed on the political basis of the consent of the governed. And from July 4, 1776, until the present year, 1876, the nation has constantly advanced toward a fuller practice of our fundamental theory, that the governed are the source of all power. Your nominating convention, occurring in this centennial year of the republic, presents a good opportunity for the complete recognition of these first principles. Our government has not yet answered the end for which it was framed, while one-half the people of the United States are deprived of the right of self-government.

Before the Revolution, Great Britain claimed the right to legislate for the colonies in all cases whatsoever; the men of this nation now as unjustly claim the right to legislate for women in all cases whatsoever.

The call for your nominating convention invites the coöperation of "all voters who desire to inaugurate and enforce the rights of every citizen, including the full and free exercise of the right of suffrage." Women are citizens; declared to be by the highest legislative and judicial authorities; but they are citizens deprived of "the full and free exercise of the right of suffrage." Your platform of 1872 declared "the Republican party mindful of its obligations to the loyal women of the nation for their noble devotion to the cause of freedom." Devotion to freedom is no new thing for the women of this nation. From the earliest history of our country, woman has shown herself as patriotic as man in every great emergency in the nation's life. From the Revolution to the present hour, woman has stood by the side of father, husband, son and brother in defense of liberty. The heroic and self-sacrificing deeds of the women of this republic, both in peace and war, must not be forgotton. Together men and women have made this country what it is. And to-day, in this one-hundredth year of our existence, the women—as members of the nation—as citizens of the United States—ask national recognition of their right of suffrage.

The Declaration of Independence struck a blow at every existent form of government, by declaring the individual the source of all power. Upon this one newly proclaimed truth our nation arose. But if States may deny suffrage to any class of citizens, or confer it at will upon any class—as according to the Minor-Happersett decision of the Supreme Court—a decision rendered under the auspices of the Republican party against suffrage as a constituent element of United States citizenship—we then possess no true national life. If States can deny suffrage to citizens of the United States, then States possess more power than the United States, and are more truly national in the character of their governments. National supremacy does not chiefly mean power "to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce"; it means national protection and security in the exercise of the right of self-government, which comes alone, by and through the use of the ballot.

Even granting the premise of the Supreme-Court decision that "the Constitution of the United States does not confer suffrage on any one"; our national life does not date from that instrument. The constitution is not the original declaration of rights. It was not framed until eleven years after our existence as a nation, nor fully ratified until nearly fourteen years after the commencement of our national life. This centennial celebration of our nation's birth does not date from the constitution, but from the Declaration of Independence. The declared purpose of the civil war was the settlement of the question of supremacy between the States and the United States. The documents sent out by the Republican party in this present campaign, warn the people that the Democrats intend another battle for State sovereignty, to be fought this year at the ballot-box.

The National Woman Suffrage Association calls your attention to the fact that the Republican party has itself reöpened this battle, and now

holds the anomalous position of having settled the question of State sovereignty in the case of black men, and again opened it, through the Minor-Happersett decision, not only in the case of women citizens, but also in the case of men citizens, for all other causes save those specified in the fifteenth amendment. Your party has yet one opportunity to retrieve its position. The political power of this country has always shown itself superior to the judicial power—the latter ever shaping and basing its decisions on the policy of the dominant party. A pledge, therefore, by your convention to secure national protection in the enjoyment of perfect equality of rights, civil and political, to all citizens, will so define the policy of the Republican party as to open the way to a full and final adjustment of this question on the basis of United States supremacy.

Aside from the higher motive of justice, we suggest your adoption of this principle of equal rights to women, as a means of securing your own future existence. The party of reform in this country is the party that lives. The party that ceases to represent the vital principles of truth and justice dies. If you would save the life of the Republican party you should now take broad national ground on this question of suffrage.

By this act you will do most to promote the general welfare, secure the blessings of liberty to yourselves and your posterity, and establish on this continent a genuine republic that shall know no class, caste, race, or sex —where all the people are citizens, and all citizens are equal before the law.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Chairman Executive Committee.*
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Corresponding Secretary.*
Centennial Headquarters, 1,431 Chestnut street, *Philadelphia*, June 10, 1876.

To the President and Members of the National Democratic Convention assembled at St. Louis, June 27, 1876:

GENTLEMEN: In reading the call for your convention, the National Woman Suffrage Association was gratified to find that your invitation was not limited to voters, but cordially extended to all citizens of the United States. We accordingly send delegates from our association, asking for them a voice in your proceedings, and also a plank in your platform declaring the political rights of women.

Women are the only class of citizens still wholly unrepresented in the government, and yet we possess every qualification requisite for voters in the several States. Women possess property and education; we take out naturalization papers and passports; we preëmpt lands, pay taxes, and suffer for our own violation of the laws. We are neither idiots, lunatics, nor criminals; and, according to your State constitutions, lack but one qualification for voters, namely, sex, which is an insurmountable qualification, and therefore equivalent to a bill of attainder against one-half the people; a power no State nor congress can legally exercise, being forbidden in article 1, sections 9, 10, of our constitution. Our rulers may have the right to regulate the suffrage, but they can not abolish it altogether for any class of citizens, as has been done in the case of the women of this republic, without a direct violation of the fundamental law of the land.

As you hold the constitution of the fathers to be a sacred legacy to us and our children forever, we ask you to so interpret that *Magna Charta* of human rights as to secure justice and equality to all United States citizens irrespective of sex. We desire to call your attention to the violation of the essential principle of self-government in the disfranchisement of the women of the several States, and we appeal to you, not only because as a minority you are in a position to consider principles, but because you were the party first to extend suffrage by removing the property qualification from all white men, and thus making the political status of the richest and poorest citizen the same. That act of justice to the laboring masses insured your power, with but few interruptions, until the war.

When the District of Columbia suffrage bill was under discussion in 1866, it was a Democratic senator (Mr. Cowan, of Pennsylvania) who proposed an amendment to strike out the word "male," and thus extend the right of suffrage to the women, as well as the black men of the District. That amendment gave us a splendid discussion on woman suffrage that lasted three days in the Senate of the United States. It was a Democratic legislature that secured the right of suffrage to the women of Wyoming, and we now ask you in national convention to pledge the Democratic party to extend this act of justice to the women throughout the nation, and thus call to your side a new political force that will restore and perpetuate your power for years to come.

The Republican party gave us a plank in their platform in 1872, pledging themselves to a "respectful consideration" of our demands. But by their constitutional interpretations, legislative enactments, and judicial decisions, so far from redeeming their pledge, they have buried our petitions and appeals under laws in direct opposition to their high-sounding promises and professions. And now (1876) they give us another plank in their platform, approving the "substantial advance made toward the establishment of equal rights for women"; cunningly reminding us that the privileges and immunities we now enjoy are all due to Republican legislation—although, under a Republican dynasty, inspectors of election have been arrested and imprisoned for taking the votes of women; temperance women arrested and imprisoned for praying in the streets; houses, lands, bonds, and stock of women seized and sold for their refusal to pay unjust taxation—and, more than all, we have this singular spectacle: a Republican woman, who had spoken for the Republican party throughout the last presidential campaign, arrested by Republican officers for voting the Republican ticket, denied the right of trial by jury by a Republican judge, convicted and sentenced to a fine of one hundred dollars and costs of prosecution; and all this for asserting at the polls the most sacred of all the rights of American citizenship—the right of suffrage—specifically secured by recent Republican amendments to the federal constitution.

Again, the Supreme Court of the United States, by its recent decision in the Minor-Happersett case, has stultified its own interpretation of constitutional law. A negro, by virtue of his United States citizenship, is

declared under recent amendments a voter in every State in the Union; but when a woman, by virtue of her United States citizenship, applies to the Supreme Court for protection in the exercise of this same right, she is remanded to the State by the unanimous decision of the nine judges on the bench, that "the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one."

All concessions of privileges or redress of grievances are but mockery for any class that has no voice in the laws and lawmakers. Hence we demand the ballot—that scepter of power—in our own hands, as the only sure protection for our rights of person and property under all conditions. If the few may grant or withhold rights at their own pleasure, the many cannot be said to enjoy the blessings of self-government. Jefferson said, "The God who gave us life gave us liberty at the same time. The hand of force may destroy, but cannot disjoin them." While the first and highest motive we would urge on you is the recognition in all your action of the great principles of justice and equality that underlie our form of government, it is not unworthy to remind you that the party that takes this onward step will reap its just reward.

Had you heeded our appeals made to you in Tammany Hall, New York, in 1868, and again in Baltimore, in 1872, your party might now have been in power, as you would have had, what neither party can boast to-day, a live issue on which to rouse the enthusiasm of the people. Reform is the watchword of the hour; but how can we hope for honor and honesty in either party in minor matters, so long as both consent to rob one-half the people—their own mothers, sisters, wives and daughters—of their most sacred rights? As a party you defended the right of self-government in Louisiana ably and eloquently during the last session of congress. Are the rights of women in all the Southern States, whose slaves are now their rulers, less sacred than those of the men of Louisiana? "The whole art of government," says Jefferson, "consists in being honest."

It needs but little observation to see that the tide of progress, in all countries, is setting toward the emancipation and enfranchisement of women; and this step in civilization is to be taken in our day and generation. Whether the Democratic party will take the initiative in this reform, and reap the glory of crowning fifteen million women with the rights of American citizenship, and thereby vindicate our theory of self-government, is the momentous question we ask you to decide in this eventful hour, as we round out the first century of our national life.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, *President.*

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Chairman Executive Committee.*

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Corresponding Secretary.*

Centennial Headquarters, 1,431 Chestnut street, *Philadelphia*, June 20, 1876.

In addition to these letters delegates were sent to both the Republican and Democratic conventions. Sara Andrews Spencer and Elizabeth Boynton Harbert were present at the Republican convention at Cincinnati; both addressed the committee on platform and resolutions, and Mrs. Spencer, on motion of Hon.

George F. Hoar, was permitted to address the convention. Mrs. Virginia L. Minor and Miss Phoebe W. Couzins were the delegates to the Democratic convention at St. Louis, and the latter addressed that vast assembly.*

For a long time there had been a growing demand for a woman's declaration to be issued on July Fourth, 1876. "Let us then protest against the falsehood of the nation"; "If the old Declaration does not include women, let us have one that will"; "Let our rulers be arraigned"; "A declaration of independence for women must be issued on the Fourth of July, 1876," were demands that came from all parts of the country. The officers of the association had long had such action in view, having, at the Washington convention, early in 1875, announced their intention of working in Philadelphia during the centennial season, and were strengthened in their determination by the hearty indorsement they received. At the May convention in New York, Matilda Joslyn Gage, in her opening speech, announced that a declaration of independence for women would be issued on the Fourth of July, 1876. In response to this general feeling, the officers of the National Association prepared a declaration of rights of the women of the United States, and articles of impeachment against the government.

Application was made by the secretary, Miss Anthony, to General Hawley, president of the centennial commission, for seats for fifty officers of the association. General Hawley replied that "only officials were invited"—that even his own wife had no place—that merely representatives and officers of the government had seats assigned them. "Then" said she, "as women have no share in the government, they are to have no seats on the platform," to which General Hawley assented; adding, however, that Mrs. Gillespie, of the woman's centennial commission, had fifty seats placed at her disposal, thus showing it to be in his power to grant places to women whenever he so chose to do. Miss Anthony said: "I ask seats for the officers of the National Woman Suffrage Association; we represent one-half the people, and why should we be denied all part in this centennial celebration?" Miss Anthony, however, secured a reporter's ticket by virtue of representing her brother's paper, *The Leavenworth*

* Letters were written to these conventions from different States. Mrs. Elizabeth L. Saxon, New Orleans, La.; Elizabeth A. Meriwether, Memphis, Tenn.; Mrs. Margaret V. Longley, Cincinnati, O., all making eloquent appeals for some consideration of the political rights of women.

Digitized by Google

Times, and, ultimately, cards of invitation were sent to four others,* representing the 20,000,000 disfranchised citizens of the nation.

Mrs. Stanton, as president of the association, wrote General Hawley, asking the opportunity to present the woman's protest and bill of rights at the close of the reading of the Declaration of Independence. Just its simple presentation and nothing more. She wrote:

We do not ask to read our declaration, only to present it to the president of the United States, that it may become an historical part of the proceedings.

Mrs. Spencer, bearer of this letter, in presenting it to General Hawley, said:

The women of the United States make a slight request on the occasion of the centennial celebration of the birth of the nation; we only ask that we may silently present our declaration of rights.

General HAWLEY replied: It seems a very slight request, but our programme is published, our speakers engaged, our arrangements for the day decided upon, and we can not make even so slight a change as that you ask.

Mrs. SPENCER replied: We are aware that your programme is published, your speakers engaged, your entire arrangements decided upon, without consulting with the women of the United States; for that very reason we desire to enter our protest. We are aware that this government has been conducted for one hundred years without consulting the women of the United States; for this reason we desire to enter our protest.

General HAWLEY replied: Undoubtedly we have not lived up to our own original Declaration of Independence in many respects. I express no opinion upon your question. It is a proper subject of discussion at the Cincinnati convention, at the St. Louis convention, in the Senate of the United States, in the State legislatures, in the courts, wherever you can obtain a hearing. But to-morrow we propose to celebrate what we have done the last hundred years; not what we have failed to do. We have much to do in the future. I understand the full significance of your very slight request. If granted, it would be the event of the day—the topic of discussion to the exclusion of all others. I am sorry to refuse so slight a demand; we cannot grant it.

General Hawley also addressed a letter to Mrs. Stanton:

DEAR MADAM: I regret to say it is impossible for us to make any change in our programme, or make any addition to it at this late hour.

Yours very respectfully,

JOS. R. HAWLEY, *President U. S. C. C.*

As General Grant was not to attend the celebration, the acting vice-president, Thomas W. Ferry, representing the government,

* Mrs. Mott, Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Gage, and Mrs. Spencer.

Digitized by Google

was to officiate in his place, and he, too, was addressed by note, and courteously requested to make time for the reception of this declaration. As Mr. Ferry was a well-known sympathizer with the demands of woman for political rights, it was presumable that he would render his aid. Yet he was forgetful that in his position that day he represented, not the exposition, but the government of a hundred years, and he too refused; thus this simple request of woman for a half moment's recognition on the nation's centennial birthday was denied by all in authority.*

While the women of the nation were thus absolutely forbidden the right of public protest, lavish preparations were made for the reception and entertainment of foreign potentates and the myrmidons of monarchial institutions. Dom Pedro, emperor of Brazil, a representative of that form of government against which the United States is a perpetual defiance and protest, was welcomed with fulsome adulation, and given a seat of honor near the officers of the day; Prince Oscar of Sweden, a stripling of sixteen, on whose shoulder rests the promise of a future kingship, was seated near. Count Rochambeau of France, the Japanese commissioners, high officials from Russia and Prussia, from Austria, Spain, England, Turkey, representing the barbarism and semi-civilization of the day, found no difficulty in securing recognition and places of honor upon that platform, where representative womanhood was denied.

Though refused by their own countrymen a place and part in the centennial celebration, the women who had taken this presentation in hand were not to be conquered. They had respectfully asked for recognition; now that it had been denied, they determined to seize upon the moment when the reading of the Declaration of Independence closed, to proclaim to the world the tyranny and injustice of the nation toward one-half its people. Five officers of the National Woman Suffrage Association, with that heroic spirit which has ever animated lovers of liberty in resistance to tyranny, determined, whatever the result, to present the woman's declaration of rights at the chosen hour. They would not, they dared not sacrifice the golden opportunity

* On the receipt of these letters a prolonged council was held by the officers of the association at their headquarters, as to what action they should take on the Fourth of July. Mrs. Mott and Mrs. Stanton decided for themselves that after these rebuffs they would not even sit on the platform, but at the appointed time go to the church they had engaged for a meeting, and open their convention. Others more brave and determined insisted that women had an equal right to the glory of the day and the freedom of the platform, and decided to take the risk of a public insult in order to present the woman's declaration and thus make it an historic document.—[E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

to which they had so long looked forward; their work was not for themselves alone, nor for the present generation, but for all women of all time. The hopes of posterity were in their hands and they determined to place on record for the daughters of 1976, the fact that their mothers of 1876 had asserted their equality of rights, and impeached the government of that day for its injustice toward woman. Thus, in taking a grander step toward freedom than ever before, they would leave one bright remembrance for the women of the next centennial.

That historic Fourth of July dawned at last, one of the most oppressive days of that terribly heated season. Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Sara Andrews Spencer, Lillie Devereux Blake and Phoebe W. Couzins made their way through the crowds under the broiling sun to Independence Square, carrying the Woman's Declaration of Rights. This declaration had been handsomely engrossed by one of their number, and signed by the oldest and most prominent advocates of woman's enfranchisement. Their tickets of admission proved open sesame through the military and all other barriers, and a few moments before the opening of the ceremonies, these women found themselves within the precincts from which most of their sex were excluded.

The declaration of 1776 was read by Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, about whose family clusters so much of historic fame. The close of his reading was deemed the appropriate moment for the presentation of the woman's declaration. Not quite sure how their approach might be met—not quite certain if at this final moment they would be permitted to reach the presiding officer—those ladies arose and made their way down the aisle. The bustle of preparation for the Brazilian hymn covered their advance. The foreign guests, the military and civil officers who filled the space directly in front of the speaker's stand, courteously made way, while Miss Anthony in fitting words presented the declaration. Mr. Ferry's face paled, as bowing low, with no word, he received the declaration, which thus became part of the day's proceedings; the ladies turned, scattering printed copies, as they deliberately walked down the platform. On every side eager hands were stretched; men stood on seats and asked for them, while General Hawley, thus defied and beaten in his audacious denial to women the right to present their declaration, shouted, "Order, order!"

Digitized by Google

Passing out, these ladies made their way to a platform erected for the musicians in front of Independence Hall. Here on this old historic ground, under the shadow of Washington's statue, back of them the old bell that proclaimed "liberty to all the land, and all the inhabitants thereof," they took their places, and to a listening, applauding crowd, Miss Anthony read* the Declaration of Rights for Women by the National Woman Suffrage Association, July 4, 1876:

While the nation is buoyant with patriotism, and all hearts are attuned to praise, it is with sorrow we come to strike the one discordant note, on this one-hundredth anniversary of our country's birth. When subjects of kings, emperors, and czars, from the old world join in our national jubilee, shall the women of the republic refuse to lay their hands with benedictions on the nation's head? Surveying America's exposition, surpassing in magnificence those of London, Paris, and Vienna, shall we not rejoice at the success of the youngest rival among the nations of the earth? May not our hearts, in unison with all, swell with pride at our great achievements as a people; our free speech, free press, free schools, free church, and the rapid progress we have made in material wealth, trade, commerce and the inventive arts? And we do rejoice in the success, thus far, of our experiment of self-government. Our faith is firm and unwavering in the broad principles of human rights proclaimed in 1776, not only as abstract truths, but as the corner stones of a republic. Yet we cannot forget, even in this glad hour, that while all men of every race, and clime, and condition, have been invested with the full rights of citizenship under our hospitable flag, all women still suffer the degradation of disfranchisement.

The history of our country the past hundred years has been a series of assumptions and usurpations of power over woman, in direct opposition to the principles of just government, acknowledged by the United States as its foundation, which are:

First—The natural rights of each individual.

Second—The equality of these rights.

Third—That rights not delegated are retained by the individual.

Fourth—That no person can exercise the rights of others without delegated authority.

Fifth—That the non-use of rights does not destroy them.

And for the violation of these fundamental principles of our government, we arraign our rulers on this Fourth day of July, 1876,—and these are our articles of impeachment:

Bills of attainder have been passed by the introduction of the word "male" into all the State constitutions, denying to women the right of suffrage, and thereby mak-

* During the reading of the declaration to an immense concourse of people, Mrs. Gage stood beside Miss Anthony, and held an umbrella over her head, to shelter her friend from the intense heat of the noonday sun; and thus in the same hour, on opposite sides of old Independence Hall, did the men and women express their opinions on the great principles proclaimed on the natal day of the republic. The declaration was handsomely framed and now hangs in the vice-president's room in the capitol at Washington.

ing sex a crime—an exercise of power clearly forbidden in article 1, sections 9, 10, of the United States constitution.

The writ of habeas corpus, the only protection against *lettres de cachet* and all forms of unjust imprisonment, which the constitution declares "shall not be suspended, except when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety demands it," is held inoperative in every State of the Union, in case of a married woman against her husband—the marital rights of the husband being in all cases primary, and the rights of the wife secondary.

The right of trial by a jury of one's peers was so jealously guarded that States refused to ratify the original constitution until it was guaranteed by the sixth amendment. And yet the women of this nation have never been allowed a jury of their peers—being tried in all cases by men, native and foreign, educated and ignorant, virtuous and vicious. Young girls have been arraigned in our courts for the crime of infanticide; tried, convicted, hanged—victims, perchance, of judge, jurors, advocates—while no woman's voice could be heard in their defense. And not only are women denied a jury of their peers, but in some cases, jury trial altogether. During the war, a woman was tried and hanged by military law, in defiance of the fifth amendment, which specifically declares: "No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases . . . . of persons in actual service in time of war." During the last presidential campaign, a woman, arrested for voting, was denied the protection of a jury, tried, convicted, and sentenced to a fine and costs of prosecution, by the absolute power of a judge of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Taxation without representation, the immediate cause of the rebellion of the colonies against Great Britain, is one of the grievous wrongs the women of this country have suffered during the century. Deploring war, with all the demoralization that follows in its train, we have been taxed to support standing armies, with their waste of life and wealth. Believing in temperance, we have been taxed to support the vice, crime and pauperism of the liquor traffic. While we suffer its wrongs and abuses infinitely more than man, we have no power to protect our sons against this giant evil. During the temperance crusade, mothers were arrested, fined, imprisoned, for even praying and singing in the streets, while men blockade the sidewalks with impunity, even on Sunday, with their military parades and political processions. Believing in honesty, we are taxed to support a dangerous army of civilians, buying and selling the offices of government and sacrificing the best interests of the people. And, moreover, we are taxed to support the very legislators and judges who make laws, and render decisions adverse to woman. And for refusing to pay such unjust taxation, the houses, lands, bonds, and stock of women have been seized and sold within the present year, thus proving Lord Coke's assertion, that "The very act of taxing a man's property without his consent is, in effect, disfranchising him of every civil right."

Unequal codes for men and women. Held by law a perpetual minor, deemed incapable of self-protection, even in the industries of the world, woman is denied equality of rights. The fact of sex, not the quantity or quality of work, in most cases, decides the pay and position; and because of this injustice thousands of fatherless girls are compelled to choose between a life of shame and starvation. Laws catering to man's vices have created two codes of morals in which penalties are graded according to the political status of the offender. Under such laws, women are fined and imprisoned if found alone in the streets, or in public places of resort, at certain hours. Under the pretense of regulating public morals, police officers seizing the occupants of disreputable houses, march the women in platoons to prison, while the men, partners in their guilt, go free. While making a show of virtue in forbidding the importation of Chinese women on the Pacific coast for immoral purposes, our rulers, in many States, and even under the shadow of the national capitol, are now proposing to legalize the sale of American womanhood for the same vile purposes.

Special legislation for woman has placed us in a most anomalous position. Women invested with the rights of citizens in one section—voters, jurors, office-holders—cross-

ing an imaginary line, are subjects in the next. In some States, a married woman may hold property and transact business in her own name; in others, her earnings belong to her husband. In some States, a woman may testify against her husband, sue and be sued in the courts; in others, she has no redress in case of damage to person, property, or character. In case of divorce on account of adultery in the husband, the innocent wife is held to possess no right to children or property, unless by special decree of the court. But in no State of the Union has the wife the right to her own person, or to any part of the joint earnings of the co-partnership during the life of her husband. In some States women may enter the law schools and practice in the courts; in others they are forbidden. In some universities girls enjoy equal educational advantages with boys, while many of the proudest institutions in the land deny them admittance, though the sons of China, Japan and Africa are welcomed there. But the privileges already granted in the several States are by no means secure. The right of suffrage once exercised by women in certain States and territories has been denied by subsequent legislation. A bill is now pending in congress to disfranchise the women of Utah, thus interfering to deprive United States citizens of the same rights which the Supreme Court has declared the national government powerless to protect anywhere. Laws passed after years of untiring effort, guaranteeing married women certain rights of property, and mothers the custody of their children, have been repealed in States where we supposed all was safe. Thus have our most sacred rights been made the football of legislative caprice, proving that a power which grants as a privilege what by nature is a right, may withhold the same as a penalty when deeming it necessary for its own perpetuation.

Representation of woman has had no place in the nation's thought. Since the incorporation of the thirteen original States, twenty-four have been admitted to the Union, not one of which has recognized woman's right of self-government. On this birthday of our national liberties, July Fourth, 1876, Colorado, like all her elder sisters, comes into the Union with the invidious word "male" in her constitution.

Universal manhood suffrage, by establishing an aristocracy of sex, imposes upon the women of this nation a more absolute and cruel depotism than monarchy; in that, woman finds a political master in her father, husband, brother, son. The aristocracies of the old world are based upon birth, wealth, refinement, education, nobility, brave deeds of chivalry; in this nation, on sex alone; exalting brute force above moral power, vice above virtue, ignorance above education, and the son above the mother who bore him.

The judiciary above the nation has proved itself but the echo of the party in power, by upholding and enforcing laws that are opposed to the spirit and letter of the constitution. When the slave power was dominant, the Supreme Court decided that a black man was not a citizen, because he had not the right to vote; and when the constitution was so amended as to make all persons citizens, the same high tribunal decided that a woman, though a citizen, had not the right to vote. Such vacillating interpretations of constitutional law unsettle our faith in judicial authority, and undermine the liberties of the whole people.

These articles of impeachment against our rulers we now submit to the impartial judgment of the people. To all these wrongs and oppressions woman has not submitted in silence and resignation. From the beginning of the century, when Abigail Adams, the wife of one president and mother of another, said, "We will not hold ourselves bound to obey laws in which we have no voice or representation," until now, woman's discontent has been steadily increasing, culminating nearly thirty years ago in a simultaneous movement among the women of the nation, demanding the right of suffrage. In making our just demands, a higher motive than the pride of sex inspires us; we feel that national safety and stability depend on

the complete recognition of the broad principles of our government. Woman's degraded, helpless position is the weak point in our institutions to-day; a disturbing force everywhere, severing family ties, filling our asylums with the deaf, the dumb, the blind; our prisons with criminals, our cities with drunkenness and prostitution; our homes with disease and death. It was the boast of the founders of the republic, that the rights for which they contended were the rights of human nature. If these rights are ignored in the case of one-half the people, the nation is surely preparing for its downfall. Governments try themselves. The recognition of a governing and a governed class is incompatible with the first principles of freedom. Woman has not been a heedless spectator of the events of this century, nor a dull listener to the grand arguments for the equal rights of humanity. From the earliest history of our country woman has shown equal devotion with man to the cause of freedom, and has stood firmly by his side in its defense. Together, they have made this country what it is. Woman's wealth, thought and labor have cemented the stones of every monument man has reared to liberty.

And now, at the close of a hundred years, as the hour-hand of the great clock that marks the centuries points to 1876, we declare our faith in the principles of self-government; our full equality with man in natural rights; that woman was made first for her own happiness, with the absolute right to herself—to all the opportunities and advantages life affords for her complete development; and we deny that dogma of the centuries, incorporated in the codes of all nations—that woman was made for man—her best interests, in all cases, to be sacrificed to his will. We ask of our rulers, at this hour, no special favors, no special privileges, no special legislation. We ask justice, we ask equality, we ask that all the civil and political rights that belong to citizens of the United States, be guaranteed to us and our daughters forever.*

The declaration was warmly applauded at many points, and after scattering another large number of printed copies, the delegation hastened to the convention of the National Association. A meeting had been appointed for twelve, in the old historic First Unitarian church, where Rev. Wm. H. Furness preached for fifty years, but whose pulpit was then filled by Joseph May, a son of Rev. Samuel J. May. To this place the ladies made their way to find the church crowded with an expectant audience, which greeted them with thanks for what they had just done; the first act of this historic day taking place on the old centennial platform in Independence Square, the last

* This document was signed by Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Paulina Wright Davis, Ernestine L. Rose, Clarina I. H. Nichols, Mary Ann McClintock, Mathilde Franceske Anneke, Sarah Pugh, Amy Post, Catharine A. F. Stebbins, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Clemence S. Lozier, Olympia Brown, Mathilde F. Wendt, Adleline Thomson, Ellen Clark Sargent, Virginia L. Minor, Catherine V. Waite, Elizabeth B. Schenck, Phoebe W. Couzins, Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Laura De Force Gordon, Sara Andrews Spencer, Lillie Devereux Blake, Jane Graham Jones, Abigail Scott Duniway, Belva A. Lockwood, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Sarah L. Williams, Abby P. Ela.

in a church so long devoted to equality and justice. The venerable Lucretia Mott, then in her eighty-fourth year, presided. Elizabeth Cady Stanton read the Declaration of Rights. Its reception by the listening audience proclaimed its need and its justice. The reading was followed by speeches upon the various points of the declaration.

Belva A. Lockwood took up the judiciary, showing the way that body lends itself to party politics. Matilda Joslyn Gage spoke upon the writ of *habeas corpus*, showing what a mockery to married women was that constitutional guarantee. Lucretia Mott reviewed the progress of the reform from the first convention. Sara Andrews Spencer illustrated the evils arising from two codes of morality. Mrs. Devereux Blake spoke upon trial by jury; Susan B. Anthony upon taxation without representation, illustrating her remarks by incidents of unjust taxation of women during the present year. Elizabeth Cady Stanton spoke upon the aristocracy of sex, and the evils arising from manhood suffrage. Judge Esther Morris, of Wyoming, said a few words in regard to suffrage in that territory. Mrs. Margaret Parker, president of the woman suffrage club of Dundee, Scotland, and of the newly-formed Christian Woman's International Temperance Union, said she had seen nothing like this in Great Britain —it was worth the journey across the Atlantic. Mr. J. H. Raper, of Manchester, England, characterized it as the historic meeting of the day, and said the patriot of a hundred years hence would seek for every incident connected with it, and the next centennial would be adorned by the portraits of the women who sat upon that platform.

The Hutchinsons, themselves of historic fame, were present. They were in their happiest vein, interspersing the speeches with appropriate and felicitous songs. Lucretia Mott did not confine herself to a single speech, but, in Quaker style, whenever the spirit moved made many happy points. When she first arose to speak, a call came from the audience for her to ascend the pulpit in order that she might be seen. As she complied with this request, ascending the long winding staircase into the old-fashioned octagon pulpit, she said, "I am somewhat like Zaccheus of old who climbed the sycamore tree his Lord to see; I climb this pulpit, not because I am of lofty mind, but because I am short of stature that you may see me." As her sweet and placid countenance appeared above the pulpit, the Hutchinsons, by

Digitized

happy inspiration, burst into "Nearer, my God, to Thee." The effect was marvelous; the audience at once arose, and spontaneously joined in the hymn.

Phoebe W. Couzins, with great pathos, referred to woman's work in the war, and the parade of the Grand Army of the Republic the preceding evening; she said:

In such an hour as this, with my soul stirred to its deepest depths, I feel unequal to the task of uttering words befitting the occasion, and to follow the dear saint who has just spoken; how can I? I am but a beginner, and to-day I feel that to sit at the feet of these dear women who have borne the heat and burden of this contest, and to learn of them is the attitude I should assume. It is not the time for argument or rhetoric. It is the time for introspection and prayer. We have come from Independence Square, where the nation is celebrating its centennial birthday of a masculine freedom. You have just heard from Mrs. Stanton the reading of Woman's Declaration of Rights; that document has already been presented in engrossed form, tied with the symbolic red, white and blue, to the presiding officer of the day, Senator Thomas W. Ferry, on their platform in yonder square; and the John Hampden of our cause, the immortal Susan B. Anthony, rendered it historic, by reading it from the steps of Independence Hall, to an immense audience there gathered, that could not gain access to the square or platform. [Great applause.] I cannot express to you in fitting language the thoughts and feelings which stirred me as I sat on the platform, awaiting the presentation of that document.

We were about to commit an overt act. Gen. Hawley, president of the centennial commission and manager of the programme, had peremptorily forbidden its presentation. Yet in the face of this—in the face of the assembled nation and representatives from the crowned heads of Europe, a handful of women actuated by the same high principles as our fathers, stirred by the same desire for freedom, moved by the same impulse for liberty, were to again proclaim the right of self-government; were again to impeach the spirit of King George manifested in our rulers, and declare that taxation without representation is tyranny, that the divine right of one-half of the people to rule the other half is also despotism. As I followed the reading of Richard Henry Lee, and marked the wild enthusiasm of its reception, and remembered that at its close, a document, as noble, as divine, as grand, as historic as that, was to be presented *in silence;* an act, as heroic, as worthy, as sublime, was to be performed in the face of the contemptuous amazement of the assembled world, I trembled with suppressed emotion. When Susan Anthony arose, with a look of intense pain, yet heroic determination in her face, I silently committed her to the Great Father who seëth not in part, to strengthen and comfort her heroic heart, and then she was lost to view in the sudden uprising caused by the burst of applause instituted by General Hawley in behalf of the Brazilian emperor. And thus at the close of the reading of a document which repudiated kings and declared the right of every person to life, to liberty

and the pursuit of individual happiness, the American people, applauding a crowned monarch, received *in silence* the immortal document and protest of its discrowned queens!

Shall I recount the emotion that swayed me, as I thought of all that woman had done to build up this country; to sustain its unity, to perpetuate its principles; of its self-denying and heroic Pilgrim and revolutionary mothers; of the work of woman in the anti-slavery cause; the agony and death of her travail in its second birth for freedom; sustaining the nation by prayers, by self-sacrificing contributions, by patriotic endeavors, by encouraging words; and, reviewing the programme, and all the attendant pageants, remembered that in these grand centennial celebrations, when the nation rounded out its first century, *not a tribute*, not a recognition in any shape, form or manner was paid to woman; that upon the platform, as honored guests, sat those who had been false in the hour of our country's peril; that upon this historic soil, stood the now freeman, once a slave, whose liberty and life were given him at the hands of woman; that the inhabitants of the far off isles of the sea, India, Asia, Africa, Europe, were gladly welcomed as free citizens, while woman, a suppliant beggar, pleaded of one man, invested with autocratic power, for the simple boon of presenting a protest in silence, against her degradation, and was *denied!*

I stood yesterday on the corner of Broad and Chestnut streets, watching the march of the Grand Army of the Republic. As the torn and tattered battle flags came by, all the terrors of that war tragedy suddenly rushed over me, and I sat down and wept. Looking again, I saw the car of wounded soldiers; as in thought I was suddenly transported to the banks of the Mississippi I felt the air full of the horrors of the battle of Shiloh, and saw two young girls waiting the landing of a steamer that had been dispatched to succor the wounded on that terrible field. They were watching for "mother"—who for the first time had left her home charge, and hushing her own heart's pleadings, heard only her country's call, and gone down to that field of carnage to tenderly care for the soldier. As they boarded the steamer, what a sight met their eyes! Maimed, bleeding, dying soldiers by the hundreds, were on cots on deck, on boxes filled with amputated limbs, and the dead were awaiting the last sad rites. Like ministering angels walked two women, their mother and the now sainted Margaret Breckenridge of Kentucky, amid these rows of sufferers, with strong nerve and steady arm, comforting the soldier boy, so far from friends and home; binding up the ghastly wound, bathing the feverish brow, smoothing the dying pillow, and with tender mother's prayer and tear, closing the eyes of the dead. The first revelation of war; how it burned our youthful brain! How it moved us to divine compassion, how it stirred us to even give up our mother to the work for years, as we heard the piteous pleading, "Don't leave us, mother"—"Oh, mother, we can never forget." But alas they *did* forget! This scene repeated again, and again, during that long conflict, with hundreds of women offering a like service in camp and floating hospital, leaving sweet homes, without money, price or thought of emolument, going to these battle-fields and

Digitized by Google

tenderly nursing the army of the republic to life again; while back of them were tens of thousands other women of the great sanitary army, who, in self-sacrifice at home, were sending lint, bandages, clothing, delicacies of food and raiment of all kinds, by car-load and ship-load, to comfort and ameliorate the sufferings of the grand army of the republic, and yet as I watched its march in this centennial year, its gala day—*not a tribute* marked its gratitude to her who had proved its savior and friend, in the hour of peril.

Again, came the colored man in rank and file—and in thought I saw the fifteenth-amendment jubilee, which proclaimed his emancipation. As banner after banner passed me, with the name of Garrison, of Phillips, of Douglass, I looked in vain for the name of Harriet Beecher Stowe, whose one book, "Uncle Tom's Cabin"—did more to arouse the whole world to the horrors of slavery, than did the words or works of any ten men. I searched for a tribute to Lucretia Mott and other women of that conflict, but none appeared. And so to-day, standing here with heart and brain convulsed with all these memories and scenes, can you wonder that we are stirred to profoundest depths, as we review the base ingratitude of this nation to its women? It has taxed its women, and asked the women, in whose veins flows the blood of their Pilgrim and Revolutionary mothers, to assist by money, individual effort and presence, to make it a year of jubilee for the proclamation of a ransomed male nationality. Zenobia, in gilded chains it may be, but chains nevertheless, marches through the streets of Philadelphia to-day, an appendage of the chariot wheels which proclaim the coming of her king, her lord, her master, whether he be white or black, native or foreign-born, virtuous or vile, lettered or unlettered. As the state-house bell, with its inscription, "Proclaim liberty—throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof," pealed forth its jubilant reiteration,—the daughters of Jefferson, of Hancock, of Adams, and Patrick Henry, who have been politically outlawed and ostracized by their own countrymen, here had no liberty proclaimed for them; they are not inhabitants, only sojourners in the land of their fathers, and as the slaves in meek subjection to the will of the master placed the crown of sovereignty on the alien from Europe, Asia, Africa, she is asked to sing in dulcet strains: "The king is dead—long live the king!"

And thus to-day we round out the first century of a professed republic,—with woman figuratively representing freedom—and yet all free, save woman.

For five long hours of that hot mid-summer's day, that crowded audience listened earnestly to woman's demand for equality of rights before the law. When the convention at last adjourned, the Hutchinsons singing, "A Hundred Years Hence,"* it was

---

* One hundred years hence, what a change will be made,
In politics, morals, religion and trade,
In statesmen who wrangle or ride on the fence,
These things will be altered *a hundred years hence.*

Our laws then will be uncompulsory rules,
Our prisons converted to national schools,

slowly and reluctantly that the great audience left the house. Judged by its immediate influence, it was a wonderful meeting. No elaborate preparations had been made, for not until late on Friday evening had it been decided upon, hoping still, as we did, for a recognition in the general celebration on Independence Square. Speakers were not prepared, hardly a moment of thought had been given as to what should be said, but words fitting for the hour came to lips rendered eloquent by the pressure of intense emotion.

Day after day visitors to the woman suffrage parlors referred to this meeting in glowing terms. Ladies from distant States, in Philadelphia to visit the exposition, said that meeting was worth the whole expense of the journey. Young women with all the attractions of the day and the exposition enticing them, yet said, "The best of all I have seen in Philadelphia was that meeting." Women to whom a dollar was of great value, said, "As much as I need money, I would not have missed that meeting for a hundred dollars"; while in the midst of conversation visitors would burst forth, "Was there *ever* such a meeting as that in Dr. Furness' church?" and thus was Woman's Declaration of Rights joyously received.

The day was also celebrated by women in convocations of their own all over the country.*

The pleasure of sinning 'tis all a pretense,
And the people will find it so, *a hundred years hence.*

Lying, cheating and fraud will be laid on the shelf,
Men will neither get drunk, nor be bound up in self,
But all live together, good neighbors and friends,
Just as *Christian folks* ought to, *a hundred years hence.*

Then woman, man's partner, man's equal shall stand,
While beauty and harmony govern the land,
To think for oneself will be no offense,
The world will be thinking *a hundred years hence.*

Oppression and war will be heard of no more,
Nor the blood of a slave leave his print on our shore,
Conventions will then be a useless expense,
For we'll all go *free-suffrage a hundred years hence.*

Instead of speech-making to satisfy wrong,
All will join the glad chorus to sing Freedom's song;
And if the Millenium is not a pretense,
We'll all be good brothers *a hundred years hence.*

This song was written in 1852, at Cleveland, Ohio, by Frances Dana Gage, expressly for John W. Hutchinson. Several of the friends were staying with Mrs. Caroline M. Severance, on their way to the Akron convention, where it was first sung.

*Protests and declarations were read by Mrs. Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, in Evanston, Ill.; Sarah L. Knox, California; Mrs. Rosa L. Segur, Toledo, Ohio; Mrs. Mary Olney Brown, Olympia, Washington territory; Mrs. Henrietta Paine Westbrook, New York city. In Maquoketa, Iowa, Mrs. Nancy R. Allen read the declaration at the regular county celebration. Madam Anneke, Wis.; Elizabeth Avery Meriwether, Tenn.; Lucinda B. Chandler, N. J.; Jane E. Telker, Iowa; S. P. Abeel, D. C.; Mrs. J. A. Johns, Oregon; Elizabeth Lisle Saxon, La.; Mrs. Elsie Stewart, Kan.; and many others impossible to name, sent in protests and declarations.

An interesting feature of the centennial parlors was an immense autograph book, in which the names of friends to the movement were registered by the thousands, some penned on that historic day and sent from the old world and the new, and others written on the spot during these eventful months. From the tidings of all these enthusiastic assemblies and immense number of letters* received in Philadelphia, unitedly demanding an extension of their rights, it was evident that the thinking women of the nation were hopefully waiting in the dawn of the new century for greater liberties to themselves.

From "Aunt Lottie's Centennial Letters to her Nieces and Nephews," we give the one describing this occasion:

MY DEARS: I suppose I had best tell you in this letter about the Fourth of July celebration at the centennial city—at least that portion of it that I know about, and which I would not have missed for the exhibition itself, and which I would not have you miss for all the rest of my letters. I cannot expect you to be as much interested in it as was I, but it is time you were becoming interested in the subject; and, if you live a half century from this time (in less than that, I hope,) you will see that what I am about to relate was, as General Hawley admitted it would be, "the event of the occasion."

At the commencement of the exhibition, Miss Susan B. Anthony and Mrs. Matilda Joslyn Gage came to Philadelphia and procured the parlors of 1,431 Chestnut street for the accommodation of the National Woman Suffrage Association. These rooms were open to the friends of the association, and public receptions were held and well attended every Tuesday and Friday evening. During these months these two ladies—assisted the latter part of the time by Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton—were engaged in preparing a history of the suffrage movement and a declaration of rights to be presented at the great centennial celebration of the Fourth of July, 1876. This document is in form like the first declaration of a hundred years ago, handsomely engrossed by Mrs. Sara Andrews Spencer, of Washington—a lady delegate to the Cincinnati Republican convention, June 12.

The celebration was held in Independence Square, just back of the old state-house where the first declaration was signed. There was a great crowd of people collected; a poem was read by Bayard Taylor and a speech delivered by William M. Evarts. But I knew it was useless to go there expecting to hear any portion of either; so I waited until twelve o'clock and then rode down in the cars to Dr. Furness' church, corner of Broad and Locust streets, where these ladies were to hold their meeting. The church was full, and the exercises were opened by Mrs. Mott—the venerable and venerated president—a Quaker lady of slight form, attired in a plain, light-silk gown, white muslin neckerchief and cap, after that exquisitely neat and quaint fashion. Then the Hutchinsons sang a hymn,

* See Appendix.

in which all were requested to join. Afterward Mrs. Stanton came to the front of the pulpit, the house was hushed to a reverential stillness, and I never yet heard anything so solemn and impressive as her reading of the Declaration of Rights of the Women of the United States.

A printed copy had been given me the day before, when between the sessions of the New England American Association in the Academy of Music, where were Lucy Stone, Julia Ward Howe, Rev. Antoinette Brown Blackwell, Elizabeth K. Churchill and other pleasant-faced, sweet-voiced ladies, I had called at the rooms on Chestnut street and folded declarations for half an hour with Mrs. Stanton, which they were distributing by post and in every way all over the land. When I read it at home that night I realized its importance, but as the next day (the Fourth) was excessively warm, I very nearly gave up going, and then I should have missed the impressiveness of her reading. When she first commenced, her voice seemed choked with emotion. She must have realized what she was doing, as we all knew it was the grandest thing that had been done in a hundred years. Thrill after thrill went through my veins, and the whole scene formed a picture that will yet be the subject of artists' pencils and poets' pens. I should have been contented to have had the meeting closed then with that best song of the Hutchinsons upon the progress of reform, where the young gentleman was so much applauded for his solo, "When Women Shall be Free." Still we were all interested in Mrs. Spencer's account of her interview with General Hawley, and his refusal to permit the silent handing-in of the declaration, which, after her persistence, assuring him "it would not take three minutes," he was obliged to confess was because he was "very well aware it would be the event of the occasion." "Immediately," said Mrs. Spencer, "you cannot imagine what an inspiration we all had to do it; for," added the slight, fair-haired, fluent lady, in a humorous manner that called forth laughter and applause, "I never yet was forbidden by a man to do a thing, but that I resolved to do it."

We were also pleased to hear from that earnest woman, Susan B. Anthony, inspired by the immutable abstract truths of justice and equity. Reports say that she has the air of a Catholic devotee. She said that in defiance of "the powers that be" she took a place on that platform in Independence square, and at the proper time delivered the engrossed copy of the declaration to the Hon. T. W. Ferry, who received it with a courteous bow; and afterward on the steps of Independence Hall she read it to an assembled multitude. She had done her centennial day's work for all time; and small wonder that mind and body craved rest after such tension. She is yet under a hundred dollars fine for voting at Rochester, and although from her lectures the last six years she has paid $10,000 indebtedness on *The Revolution*, she said she never would have paid that fine had she been imprisoned till now.

Mrs. Lucretia Mott, whom the younger Hutchinson* assisted into the pulpit—a beautiful sight to see cultured youth supporting refined old age—stated that she went up there, "not because she was higher-minded

* Henry Hutchinson, the son of John.

Digitized by Google

than the rest, but so that her enfeebled voice might be better heard." The dear old soul is so much stronger than her body, that it would seem that she must have greatly overtasked herself; though an inspired soul has wonderful recuperative forces at command for the temple it inhabits. A goodly number of gentlemen were present at this meeting and that of the day before—three or four of them making short speeches. A Mr. Raper of England, strongly interested in the temperance and woman suffrage cause, told us that in his country "all women tax-payers voted for guardians of the poor, upon all educational matters, and also upon all municipal affairs. In that respect she was in advance of this professed republic. In England there is an hereditary aristocracy, here, an aristocracy of sex"; or, as the spirited Lillie Devereux Blake who was present once amusingly termed it, of "the bifurcated garment." And now perhaps some materially-minded person will ask, "What are you going to do about it? You can't fight!" forgetting that we are now fighting the greatest of all battles, and that the weapons of woman's warfare, like her nature at its best development, are moral and spiritual. LEWISE OLIVER.

Philadelphia, July 13, 1876.

The press of the country commented extensively upon the action of the women:

At noon to-day, in the First Unitarian church, corner Tenth and South, the National Woman Suffrage Association will present the Woman's Declaration of Rights. The association will hold a convention at the same time and place, at which Lucretia Mott is announced to preside, and several ladies to make speeches. Most of the ladies are known as women of ability and earnest apostles of the creed they have espoused for the political enfranchisement of women. Their declaration of rights, we do not doubt, will be strongly enforced. These ladies, or some of them, have been assigned places upon the platform at the grand celebration ceremonies to take place in Independence Square to-day; and they have requested leave to present their declaration of rights in form on that occasion. They do not ask to have it read, we believe, but simply that the statement of their case shall go on file with the general archives of the day, so that the women of 1976 may see that their predecessors of 1876 did not let the centennial year of independence pass without protest.—[Philadelphia *Ledger*, July 4.

There was yet another incident of the Fourth, in Independence Square. Immediately after the Declaration of Independence had been read by Richard Henry Lee, and while the strains of the "Greeting from Brazil" were rising upon the air, two ladies pushed their way vigorously through the crowd and appeared upon the speaker's platform. They were Susan B. Anthony and Matilda Joslyn Gage. Hustling generals aside, elbowing governors, and almost upsetting Dom Pedro in their charge, they reached Vice-President Ferry, and handed him a scroll about three feet long, tied with ribbons of various colors. He was seen to bow and look bewildered; but they had retreated in the same vigorous manner before the explanation was whispered about. It appears that they demanded a change of programme for the sake of reading their address; but if so, this was probably a mere form intended for future effect. More than six months ago some of the advocates of female suffrage began in this city their crusade against celebrating the centennial anniversary of a nation wherein women are not permitted to vote. The demand of Miss Anthony and Mrs. Gage to be allowed to take part in a commemoration which many of their associates discouraged and denounced, would have been a cool proceeding had it been made in advance. Made, as it was, through a very discourteous interruption, it pre-

figures new forms of violence and disregard of order which may accompany the participation of women in active partisan politics.—[New York *Tribune.*

The letter of a correspondent, printed in another column, describing the presentation of a woman's bill of rights, in Independence Square on the Fourth of July, will interest all readers, whether or not they think with the correspondent, that this little affair was the most important of the day's proceedings. We have not a doubt that the persons who were concerned in the affair enjoyed it heartily. Those of them who made speeches naturally regarded their eloquence as a thing to stir the nation. All persons who make speeches do. The day was a warm one, and imagination, like the fire-cracker, was on fire. In the heat of the occasion, of course, the women who want to vote and who desire the protection of the writ of *habeas corpus* against the tyranny of actual or possible husbands, felt that they were making great folios of history; but the sagacity of the press agents and reporters was not at fault. The gatherers of news know very well what they are about; and when they decided to omit this part of the proceedings from their reports, they simply obeyed that instinct upon which their livelihood depends—the instinct, namely, to write only of matters in which the public is interested.

The good women who wrote and published this declaration, fancying that they were throwing a boombshell into the gathered crowds of American (male) citizens, are very much in earnest, doubtless, and are entitled—we have platform authority for saying it— to "respectful consideration"; but their movement scarcely rises, as yet at least, to the dignity of a great historical event. There is a prevailing indifference to their cause which is against it. The public is not aroused to a fever heat of indignation over the wrongs which women are everywhere suffering at the hands of the tyrants called husbands. The popular mind is not yet awake to the fact that men usually imprison their wives in back parlors and maltreat them shamefully. The witnesses, wives to wit, refuse to bear testimony to this effect, and the public placidly accepts appearance for reality and believes that the gentlewomen who ride about in their carriages or haunt the shops of our cities in gay apparel are reasonably well contented with their lot in life. In a word, it is not hostility so much as calm indifference with which the advocates of woman suffrage have to contend, and unluckily for them the indifference is very largely feminine.—[New York *Evening Post.*

There is something awful in the thought that should the woman suffragists be continually refused a voice in the affairs of the nation they might at last in a fit of desperation, do what our fathers did, and frame a declaration of independence, No, 2. Just think of an army of crinolines willing to take arms against the tyrant man, and sacrifice their lives, if need be, to carry out their principles! It is easier to ridicule the woman suffrage movement than to answer the arguments advanced by some of the leading advocates of that question. It is only the innate mildness of the position of women in general that has prevented a revolution on this same subject long ago. One hundred thousand such fire-eaters as Susan B. Anthony or Elizabeth Cady Stanton in the land, could raise a rumpus which would cause the late unpleasantness to pale into insignificance. Armed and equipped, what a sight would be presented by an army of strong-minded women! There would be no considering the question of whether the cavalry should ride side-saddle, or *a la* clothes-pin. Such detail would be of too small importance to receive the slightest attention; the more vital questions would be, "How can we slaughter the most men?" "How can we soonest convince the demons that we have rights which must be respected?" The fact is, that if these down-trodden women would take a firm stand in any thing like respectable numbers, and assert their claims to suffrage at the point of the bayonet, they would be allowed everything they asked for. There is not a man in the land who would dare to take up arms against a woman. Such a dernier resort on the part of the women would be truly laughable, but the matter would cease to be a joke, if General Susan B. Anthony, in command of a bloomer regiment, should march into the halls of congress, armed *cap-a-pie*, and demand the passage of a law in behalf of woman suffrage, or the alternative of the general clean-

ing out of the whole body. There is no immediate prospect of such an event, but "hell hath no furies like a woman scorned." Long and loud have been the appeals of the fair sex for recognition at the ballot-box. With that faithful zeal so truly characteristic of her sex, she has each time, for many years in the history of this country, presented herself before the curious gaze of our national conventions, asking, with no little stress of argument, for a woman's plank in the platforms. If she has been heard at all in the framed resolutions of the parties, the feeling prevailing in the conventions has been rather to pacify and put her off, than to grant her request through motives of political policy. If perseverance is to be awarded, the agitators of the woman question will yet carry off the prize they seek. Death alone can silence such women as Susan B. Anthony and Cady Stanton, and their teachings will live after them and unite others of their sex into strong bands of sisterhood in a common cause. It is safe to say, if events march on in the same direction they have since the calling of the first National Woman's Convention, another centennial will see woman in the halls of legislation throughout the land, and so far as we are concerned we have no objection, so long as she behaves herself.—[St. Louis *Dispatch*, July 13.

It is a curious anomaly that the movement for national woman suffrage in our country is most obstructed by women, and that even where the men have doubts, their natural admiration for the gentler sex almost converts them into champions. Certain it is that the Declaration of Rights of the Women of the United States that the National Woman Suffrage Association presented to the vice-president, Mr. Ferry, while he was surrounded by foreign princes and potentates and by the governors of most of the States of the union, faced at the same time by a countless mass of American and foreign visitors—certain it is, we repeat, that when this altogether unique paper was presented by Miss Susan B. Anthony and her sisters, it became a record in the minds and memory of all who witnessed the strange proceeding. And it is a very well written statement, and no doubt one hundred years hence it will be read with an interest not less ecstatic than the enthusiasm of its present pioneers; for, in the interval, these advanced women may have won for their withholding sisters the entire list of male prerogatives. What adds to the force of the present woman suffrage party is the dignity, intelligence and purity of its participants. The venerable Lucretia Mott; the honest, straightforward Susan B. Anthony; the cultivated Ellen Clark Sargent (wife of the California senator); the beloved Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and indeed all the names attached to the declaration command our respect. Whatever we may think of the points of the declaration itself, with all our sincere admiration of these gentlewomen, increased by the knowledge everywhere that they are ardent republicans, we fear that their weakness, to employ a paradox, consists in their strength, or, in other words, that it is difficult to induce even the most benevolent and sympathetic observer to believe that they are really as much persecuted and oppressed as they claim to be. When the colored man demanded his rights they were given to him because these rights in republican constitutions were regarded as inherent, and also because he had reciprocal duties to discharge, and heavy burdens to carry, and when the Southern confederate demanded restitution of his rights, he rested his claim upon the double basis that he had earned forgiveness by his bravery, and that political disfranchisement did not belong to a republican example. Fortunately or unfortunately, it is very different with the ladies; and so when they come forward insisting upon rights heretofore accorded to men alone, they must encounter all the differences created by the delicacy of their own sisters and the reverence and love of the men, and the hard fact that these two influences have made it heretofore impossible for women to descend to the arena of politics. Having said this much, we present a few of the cardinal points of the woman's declaration of rights laid before the august memorial centennial celebration last Tuesday, July 4, 1876.—[Philadelphia *Press*, July 15.

On July 19, the Citizens' Suffrage Association, of Philadelphia, joined with the National Association in commemorating the first

woman's rights convention called by Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, at Seneca Falls, N. Y., July 19, 1848—thus celebrating the twenty-eighth anniversary of that historic event. The meeting was presided over by Edward M. Davis, president of the association, son-in-law of Lucretia Mott, and one of the most untiring workers in the cause. The venerable Lucretia Mott addressed the meeting, and Miss Anthony read letters from several of the earliest and most valued pioneers of the movement:

TENAFLY, New Jersey, July 19, 1876.

LUCRETIA MOTT—*Esteemed Friend:* It is twenty-eight years ago to-day since the first woman's rights convention ever held assembled in the Wesleyan chapel at Seneca Falls, N. Y. Could we have foreseen, when we called that convention, the ridicule, persecution, and misrepresentation that the demand for woman's political, religious and social equality would involve; the long, weary years of waiting and hoping without success; I fear we should not have had the courage and conscience to begin such a protracted struggle, nor the faith and hope to continue the work. Fortunately for all reforms, the leaders, not seeing the obstacles which block the way, start with the hope of a speedy success. Our demands at the first seemed so rational that I thought the mere statement of woman's wrongs would bring immediate redress. I thought an appeal to the reason and conscience of men against the unjust and unequal laws for women that disgraced our statute books, must settle the question. But I soon found, while no attempt was made to answer our arguments, that an opposition, bitter, malignant, and persevering, rooted in custom and prejudice, grew stronger with every new demand made, with every new privilege granted.

How well I remember that July day when the leading ladies and gentlemen of the busy town crowded into the little church; lawyers loaded with books, to expound to us the laws; ladies with their essays, and we who had called the convention, with our declaration of rights, speeches, and resolutions. With what dignity James Mott, your sainted husband, tall and stately, in Quaker costume, presided over our novel proceedings. And your noble sister, Martha C. Wright, was there. Her wit and wisdom contributed much to the interest of our proceedings, and her counsel in a large measure to what success we claimed for our first convention. While so many of those early friends fell off through indifference, fear of ridicule and growing conservatism, she remained through these long years of trial steadfast to the close of a brave, true life. She has been present at nearly every convention, with her encouraging words and generous contributions, and being well versed in Cushing's Manual, has been one of our chief presiding officers. And my heart is filled with gratitude, even at this late day, as I recall the earnestness and eloquence with which Frederick Douglass advocated our cause, though at that time he had no rights himself that any white man was bound to respect. I marvel now, that in our inexperience the interest was so well sustained through two entire days, and that when the meeting adjourned everybody signed the declaration and went home feeling that a new era had dawned for woman. What had been done and

Digitized by Google

said seemed so preëminently wise and proper that none of us thought of being ridiculed, ostracised, or suspected of evil. But what was our surprise and chagrin to find ourselves, in a few days, the target for the press of the nation; the New York *Tribune* being our only strong arm of defense.

Looking over these twenty-eight years, I feel that what we have achieved, as yet, bears no proportion to what we have suffered in the daily humiliation of spirit from the cruel distinctions based on sex. Though our State laws have been essentially changed, and positions in the schools, professions, and world of work secured to woman, unthought of thirty years ago, yet the undercurrent of popular thought, as seen in our social habits, theological dogmas, and political theories, still reflects the same customs, creeds, and codes that degrade women in the effete civilizations of the old world. Educated in the best schools to logical reasoning, trained to liberal thought in politics, religion and social ethics under republican institutions, American women cannot brook the discriminations in regard to sex that were patiently accepted by the ignorant in barbarous ages as divine law. And yet subjects of emperors in the old world, with their narrow ideas of individual rights, their contempt of all womankind, come here to teach the mothers of this republic their true work and sphere. Such men as Carl Schurz, breathing for the first time the free air of our free land, object to what we consider the higher education of women, fitting them for the trades and professions, for the sciences and arts, and self-complacently point Lucretia Mott, Maria Mitchell, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Susan B. Anthony, to their appropriate sphere, as housekeepers with a string of keys, like Madam Bismark, dangling around their waists.

The Rev. J. G. Holland, the Tupper of our American literature, thanks his Creator that woman has no specialty. She was called into being for man's happiness and interest—his helpmeet—to wait and watch his movements, to second his endeavors, to fight the hard battle of life behind him whose brain may be dizzy with excess, whose limbs may be paralyzed, or if sound in body, may be without aim or ambition, without plans or projects, destitute of executive ability or good judgment in the business affairs of life. And such sentimentalists, after demoralizing women with their twaddle, discourage our demand for the right of suffrage by pointing us to the fact that the majority of women are indifferent to this movement in their behalf. Suppose they are; have not the masses of all oppressed classes been apathetic and indifferent until partial success crowned the enthusiasm of the few? Carl Schurz would not have been exiled from his native land could he have roused the majority of his countrymen to the same love of liberty which burned in his own soul. Were his dreams of freedom less real because the stolid masses were not awake to their significance? Shall a soul that accepts martyrdom for a principle be told he is sacrificing himself to a shadow because the multitude can neither see nor appreciate the idea?

I do not feel like rejoicing over any privileges already granted to my sex, until all our rights are conceded and secured and the principle of

equality recognized and proclaimed, for every step that brings us to a more equal plane with man but makes us more keenly feel the loss of those rights we are still denied—more susceptible to the insults of his assumptions and usurpations of power. As I sum up the indignities toward women, as illustrated by recent judicial decisions—denied the right to vote, denied the right to practice in the Supreme Court, denied jury trial—I feel the degradation of sex more bitterly than I did on that July 19, 1848, and never more than in listening to your speech in Philadelphia on the Fourth of July, our nation's centennial birthday, remembering that neither years nor wisdom, brave words nor noble deeds, could secure political honor or call forth national homage for women. Let it be remembered by our daughters in future generations that Lucretia Mott, in the eighty-fourth year of her age, asked permission, as the representative woman of this great movement for the enfranchisement of her sex, to present at the centennial celebration of our national liberties, Woman's Declaration of Rights, and was refused! This was the "respectful consideration" vouchsafed American women at the close of the first century of our national life.

May we now safely prophesy justice, liberty, equality for our daughters ere another centennial birthday shall dawn upon us!

Sincerely yours, ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

DETROIT, July 17, 1876.

To Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Mary Ann McClintock and daughters, Amy Post, and all associated with them and myself in the first Woman's Rights Convention, held in Seneca Falls, N. Y., July 19, 1848, as well as to our later and present associates, Greeting:

Not able to be with you in your celebration of the nineteenth, I will yet give evidence that I prize your remembrance of our first assemblage and of our earliest work. That is, and will ever be, as the present is a memorable year; and may this be memorable too for the same reason, a brave step in advance for human freedom. I would that it could be a conclusive step in legislation for the political freedom of the women of the nation. For it is only in harmony with reason and experience to predict that the men as well as the women of the near future will rejoice if this centennial year is thus marked and glorified by so grand a deed.

We may well congratulate each other and have satisfaction in knowing that we have changed the public sentiment and the laws of many States by our advocacy and labors. We also know that while helping the growth of our own souls, we have set many women thinking and reading on this vital question, who in turn have discussed it in private and public, and thus inspired others. So that at this present time few who have examined can deny our claim. But we are grateful to remember many women who needed no arguments, whose clear insight and reason pronounced in the outset that a woman's soul was as well worth saving as a man's; that her independence and free choice are as necessary and as valuable to the public virtue and welfare; who saw and still see in both, equal children of a Father who loves and protects all.

Men do not need to be convinced of the righteousness of entire freedom for us; they have long been convinced of its justice; they confess that it is only expediency which makes them withhold that which they profess is precious to them. We await only an awakened conscience and an enlarged statesmanship.

I bid you and the women of the republic God-speed, and close in the language of one who went before us, Mary Wollstonecraft, who did so much in a thoughtless age to bring both men and women back to virtue and religion. She says: "Contending for the rights of woman, my main argument is built on this simple principle, that if she be not prepared by education to become the companion of man, she will stop the progress of knowledge and virtue; for truth must be common to all or it will be inefficacious with respect to its influence in general practice. And how can woman be expected to coöperate unless she know why she ought to be virtuous; unless freedom strengthen her reason till she comprehends her duty and sees in what manner it is connected with her real good? If children are to be educated to understand the true principle of patriotism, their mother must be a patriot; and the love of mankind from which an orderly train of virtues spring, can only be produced by considering the moral and civil interests of mankind; but the education and situation of woman at present shuts her out from such investigations."

With the greatest possible interest in your celebration and deliberations, and assuring you that I shall be with you in thought and spirit, I am most earnestly and cordially yours,

CATHARINE A. F. STEBBINS.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., June 27, 1876.

MY DEAR SUSAN ANTHONY: I thank thee most deeply for the assurance of a welcome to your deliberative councils in our country's centennial year, to reannounce our oft-repeated protest against bondage to tyrant law. Most holy cause! Woman's equality, why so long denied? . . . . I was ready at the first tap of the drum that sounded from that hub of our country, Seneca Falls, in 1848, calling for an assembly of men and women to set forth and remonstrate against the legal usurpation of our rights. . . . I cannot think of anything that would give me as much pleasure as to be able to meet with you at this time. I am exceedingly glad that you appreciate the blessings of frequent visits and wise counsel from our beloved and venerated pioneer, Lucretia Mott. I hope her health and strength will enable her to see and enjoy the triumphant victory of this work, and I wish you all the blessings of happiness that belong to all good workers, and my love to them all as if named. AMY POST.

POMO, Mendocino Co., California, June 26, 1876.

July 4, 1776, our revolutionary fathers—in convention assembled—declared their independence of the mother country; solemnly asserted the divine right of self-government and its relation to constituted authority. With liberty their shibboleth, the colonies triumphed in their long and fierce struggle with the mother country, and established an independent government. They adopted a "bill of rights" embodying their ideal of a free government.

With singular inconsistency almost their first act, while it secured to one-half the people of the body politic the right to tax and govern themselves, subjected the other half to the very oppression which had culminated in the rebellion of the colonies, "taxation without representation," and the inflictions of an authority to which they had not given their consent. The constitutional provision which enfranchised the male population of the new State and secured to it self-governing rights, disfranchised its women, and eventuated in a tyrannical use of power, which, exercised by husbands, fathers, and brothers, is infinitely more intolerable than the despotic acts of a foreign ruler.

As if left ignobly to illustrate the truths of their noble declarations, no sooner did the enfranchised class enter upon the exercise of their usurped powers than they proceeded to alienate from the mothers of humanity rights declared to be inseparable from humanity itself! Had they thrust the British yoke from the necks of their wives and daughters as indignantly as they thrust it from their own, the legal subjection of the women of to-day would not stand out as it now does—the reproach of our republican government. As if sons did not follow the condition of the mothers—as if daughters had no claim to the birthright of the fathers—they established for disfranchised woman a "dead line," by retaining the English common law of marriage, which, unlike that of less liberal European governments, converts the marriage altar into an executioner's block and recognizes woman as a wife only when so denuded of personal rights that in legal phrase she is said to be—"dead in law"!

More considerate in the matter of forms than the highwayman who kills that he may rob the unresisting dead, our gallant fathers executed women who must need cross the line of human happiness—legally; and administered their estate; and decreed the disposition of their defunct personalities in legislative halls; only omitting to provide for the matrimonial crypt the fitting epitaph: "Here lies the relict of American freedom—taxed to pauperism, loved to death!"

With all the modification of the last quarter of a century, our English law of marriage still invests the husband with a sovereignty almost despotic over his wife. It secures to him her personal service and savings, and the control and custody of her person as against herself. Having thus reduced the wife to a dead pauper owing service to her husband, our shrewd forefathers, to secure the bond, confiscated her natural obligations as a child and a mother. Whether married or single, only inability excuses a son from the legal support of indigent and infirm parents. The married daughter, in the discharge of her wifely duties, may tenderly care and toil for her husband's infirm parents, or his children and grandchildren by a prior marriage, while her own parents, or children by a prior marriage—legally divested of any claim on her or the husband who absorbs her personal services and earnings—are sent to the poor-house, or pine in bitter privation; except with consent of her husband, she can give neither her personal care nor the avails of her industry, for their benefit. So, to be a wife, woman ceases, in law, to be anything else—yields up the ghost of a legal existence! That she escapes the extreme

Digitized by Google

penalty of her legal bonds in any case is due to the fact that the majority of men, married or single, are notably better than their laws.

Our fathers taught the quality and initiated the form of free government. But it was left to their posterity to learn from the discipline of experience, that truths, old as the eternities, are forever revealing new phases to render possible more perfect interpretations; and to accumulate unanswerable reasons for their extended application. That the sorest trials and most appreciable failures of the government our fathers bequeathed to us, have been the direct and inevitable results of their departures from the principles they enunciated, is so patent to all christendom, that free government itself has won from our mistakes material to revolutionize the world—lessons that compel depotisms to change their base and constitutional monarchies to make broader the phylacteries of popular rights.

Is it not meet then, that on this one-hundredth anniversary of American independence the daughters of revolutionary sires should appeal to the sons to fulfill what the fathers promised but failed to perform—should appeal to them as the constituted executors of the father's will, to give full practical effect to the self-evident truths, that "taxation without representation is tyranny"—that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"? With an evident common interest in all the affairs of which government properly or improperly takes cognizance, we claim enfranchisement on the broad ground of human right, having proved the justice of our claim by the injustice which has resulted to us and ours through our disfranchisement.

We ask enfranchisement in the abiding faith that with our coöperative efforts free government would attain to higher averages of intelligence and virtue; with an innate conviction, that the sequestration of rights in the homes of the republic makes them baneful nurseries of the monopolies, rings, and fraudulent practices that are threatening the national integrity; and that so long as the fathers sequester the rights of the mothers and train their sons to exercise, and the daughters to submit to the exactions of usurped powers, our government offices will be dens of thieves and the national honor trail in the dust; and honest men come out from the fiery ordeals of faithful service, denuded of the confidence and respect justly their due. Give us liberty. We are mothers, wives, and daughters of freemen.

C. I. H. NICHOLS.

LONDON, Eng., July 4, 1876.

MY DEAR SUSAN: I sincerely thank you for your kind letter. Many times I have thought of writing to you, but I knew your time was too much taken up with the good cause to have any to spare for private correspondence. Occasionally I am pleased to see a good account of you and your doings in the Boston *Investigator*. Oh, how I wish I could be with you on this more than ordinarily interesting and important occasion; or that I could at least send my sentiments and views on human rights, which I have advocated for over forty years, to the convention.

This being the centenary day of the proclamation of American independence, I must write a few lines, if but to let the friends know that

though absent in body I am with you in the cause for which, in common with you, I have labored so long, and I hope not labored in vain.

The glorious day upon which human equality was first proclaimed ought to be commemorated, not only every hundred years, or every year, but it ought to be constantly held before the public mind until its grand principles are carried into practice. The declaration that "All men [which means all human beings irrespective of sex] have an equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," is enough for woman as for man. We need no other; but we must reassert in 1876 what 1776 so gloriously proclaimed, and call upon the law-makers and the law-breakers to carry that declaration to its logical consistency by giving woman the right of representation in the government which she helps to maintain; a voice in the laws by which she is governed, and all the rights and privileges society can bestow, the same as to man, or disprove its validity. We need no other declaration. All we ask is to have the laws based on the same foundation upon which that declaration rests, viz.: upon equal justice, and not upon sex. Whenever the rights of man are claimed, moral consistency points to the equal rights of woman.

I hope these few lines will fill a little space in the convention at Philadelphia, where my voice has so often been raised in behalf of the principles of humanity. I am glad to see my name among the vice-presidents of the National Association. Keep a warm place for me with the American people. I hope some day to be there yet. Give my love to Mrs. Mott and Sarah Pugh. With kind regards from Mr. Rose,

Yours affectionately, ERNESTINE L. ROSE.

A new paper, *The Ballot-Box*, was started in the centennial year at Toledo, Ohio, owned and published by Mrs. Sarah Langdon Williams. The following editorial on the natal day of the republic is from her pen:

THE RETROSPECT.—Since our last issue the great centennial anniversary of American independence has come and gone; it has been greeted with rejoicing throughout the land; its events have passed into history. The day in which the great principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence were announced by the revolutionary fathers to the world has been celebrated through all this vast heritage, with pomp and popular glorification, and the nation's finest orators have signalized the event in "thoughts that breathe and words that burn." Everywhere has the country been arrayed in its holiday attire—the gay insignia which, old as the century, puts on fresh youth and brilliancy each time its colors are unfurled. The successes which the country has achieved have been portrayed with glowing eloquence, the people's sovereignty has been the theme of congratulation and the glorious principles of freedom and equal rights have been enthusiastically proclaimed. In the magnificent oration of Mr. Evarts delivered in Independence Square, the spot made sacred by the signing of the Declaration of Independence which announced that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," these words occur:

The chief concern in this regard, to us and the rest of the world is, whether the proud trust, the profound radicalism, the wide benevolence which spoke in the declaration and were infused into the constitution at the first, have been in good-faith adhered to by the people, and whether now the living principles supply the living forces which sustain and direct government and society. He who doubts needs but to look around to find all things full of the original spirit and testifying to its wisdom and strength.

Yet that very day in that very city was a large assemblage of women convened to protest against the gross wrongs of their sex—the representatives of twenty millions of citizens of the United States, composing one-half of the population being governed without their consent by the other half, who, by virtue of their superior strength, held the reins of power and tyrannically denied them all representation. At that very meeting at which that polished falsehood was uttered had the women, but shortly before, been denied the privilege of silently presenting their declaration of rights. More forcibly is this mortifying disregard of the claims of women thrust in their faces from the fact that, amid all this magnificent triumph with which the growth of the century was commemorated, amid the protestations of platforms all over the country of the grand success of the principle of equal rights for all, the possibility of the future according equal rights to women as well as to men was, with the exception of one or two praiseworthy instances, as far as reports have reached us, utterly ignored. The women have no country—their rights are disregarded, their appeals ignored, their protests scorned, they are treated as children who do not comprehend their own wants, and as slaves whose crowning duty is obedience.

Whether, on this great day of national triumph and national aspiration, the possibilities of a better future for women were forgotten; whether, from carelessness, willfulness, or wickedness, their grand services and weary struggles in the past and hopes and aspirations for the future were left entirely out of the account, certain it is that our orators were too much absorbed in the good done by men and for men, to once recur to the valuable aid, self-denying patriotism and lofty virtues of the nation's unrepresented women. There were a few exceptions: Col. Wm. M. Ferry, of Ottawa county, Michigan, in his historical address delivered in that county, July Fourth, took pains to make favorable mention of the daughter of one of the pioneers, as follows:

Louisa Constant, or "Lisette," as she was called, became her father's clerk when twelve years old, and was as well known for wonderful faculties for business as she was for her personal attractions. In 1828, when Lisette was seventeen years old, her father died. She closed up his business with the British Company, engaged with the American Fur Company, at Mackinaw, receiving from them a large supply of merchandise, and for six years conducted the most successful trading establishment in the northwest.

Think of it, ye who disparage the ability of woman! This little tribute we record with gratification. Colonel Ferry remembered woman. Henry Ward Beecher, in his oration, delivered at Peekskill, is reported to have said:

And now there is but one step more—there is but one step more. We permit the lame, the halt and the blind to go to the ballot-box; we permit the foreigner and the

black man, the slave and the freeman, to partake of the suffrage; there is but one thing left out, and that is the mother that taught us, and the wife that is thought worthy to walk side by side with us. It is woman that is put lower than the slave, lower than the ignorant foreigner. She is put among the paupers whom the law won't allow to vote; among the insane whom the law won't allow to vote. But the days are numbered in which this can take place, and she too will vote.

But these words are followed by others somewhat problematical, at least in the respect rendered to women:

As in a hundred years suffrage has extended its bounds till it now includes the whole population, in another hundred years everything will vote, unless it be the power of the loom, and the locomotive, and the watch, and I sometimes think, looking at these machines and their performances, that they too ought to vote.

But Mr. Evarts approached the close of his oration with these words—and may they not be prophetic—may not the orator have spoken with a deeper meaning than he knew?

With these proud possessions of the past, with powers matured, with principles settled, with habits formed, the nation passes as it were from preparatory growth to responsible development of character and the steady performance of duty. What labors await it, what trials shall attend it, what triumphs for human nature, what glory for itself, are prepared for this people in the coming century, we may not assume to foretell.

Whether the wise (?) legislators see it or not—whether the undercurrent that is beating to the shore speaks with an utterance that is comprehensible to their heavy apprehensions or not, the coming century has in preparation for the country a truer humanity, a better justice of which the protest and declaration of the fathers pouring its vital current down through the departed century, and surging on into the future, is, to the seeing eye, the sure forerunner, the seed-time, of which the approaching harvest will bring a better fruition for women—and they who scoff now will be compelled to rejoice hereafter. But as Mr. Evarts remarked in his allusions to future centennials:

By the mere circumstance of this periodicity our generation will be in the minds, in the hearts, on the lips of our countrymen at the next centennial commemoration in comparison with their own character and condition and with the great founders of the nation. What shall they say of us? How shall they estimate the part we bear in the unbroken line of the nation's progress? And so on, in the long reach of time, forever and forever, our place in the secular roll of the ages must always bring us into observation and criticism.

Shall it then be recorded of us that the demand and the protest of the women were not made in vain? Shall it be told to future generations that the cry for justice, the effort to sunder the shackles with which woman has been oppressed from the dim ages ot the past, was heeded? Or, shall it be told of us, in the beginning of this second centennial, that justice has been ignored, that only liberty to men entered at this stage of progress, into the American idea of self-government? Freedom to men and women alike is but a question of time—is America now equal to the great occasion? Has her development expanded to that degree where her legislators can say in very truth, as of the colored man, "Let the oppressed go free"?

The woman's pavilion upon the centennial grounds was an after-thought, as theologians claim woman herself to have been.* The women of the country after having contributed nearly $100,000 to the centennial stock, found there had been no provision made for the separate exhibition of their work. The centennial board, Mrs. Gillespie, president, then decided to raise funds for the erection of a separate building to be known as the Woman's Pavilion. It covered an acre of ground and was erected at an expense of $30,000, a small sum in comparison with the money which had been raised by women and expended on the other buildings, not to speak of State and national appropriations which the taxes levied on them had largely helped to swell.

The pavilion was no true exhibit of woman's work. First, few women are as yet owners of business which their industry largely makes remunerative. Cotton factories in which thousands of women work, are owned by men. The shoe business, in some branches of which women are doing more than half, is under the ownership of men. Rich embroideries from India, rugs of downy softness from Turkey, the muslin of Dacca, anciently known as "The Woven Wind," the pottery and majolica ware of P. Pipsen's widow, the cartridges and envelopes of Uncle Sam, Waltham watches whose finest mechanical work is done by women, and ten thousand other industries found no place in the pavilion. Said United States Commissioner Meeker,† of Colorado, "Woman's work comprises three-fourths of the exposition; it is scattered through every building; take it away and there would be no exposition."

But this pavilion rendered one good service to woman in showing her capabilities as an engineer. The boiler which furnished the force for running its work was under the management of a young Canadian girl, Miss Alison, who from a child loved machinery, spending much time in the large saw and grist mills of her father, run by engines of two- and three-hundred horse-power, which she sometimes managed for amusement. When her name was proposed for running the pavilion machinery it brought much opposition. It was said the committee would some day find the pavilion blown to atoms; that the woman engineer would spend her time reading novels, instead of watching the steam gauge;

* A German legend says, God first made a mouse, but seeing he had made a mistake he made the cat as an afterthought, therefore if woman is God's afterthought, man must be a mistake.

† Afterwards killed by the Indians in Colorado.

that the idea was impracticable and should not be thought of. But Miss Alison soon proved her own capabilities and the falseness of these prophecies by taking her place in the engine-room and managing its workings with the ease that a child spins a top. Six power looms on which women wove carpets, webbing, silks, etc., were run by this engine. At a later period the printing of *The New Century for Women*, a paper published by the centennial commission in the woman's building, was also done by its means. Miss Alison declared the work to be more cleanly, more pleasant, and infinitely less fatiguing than cooking over a kitchen stove. "Since I have been compelled to earn my own livelihood," she said, "I have never been engaged in work I liked so well. Teaching school is much harder, and one is not paid as well." She expressed confidence in her ability to manage the engine of an ocean steamer, and said there were thousands of small engines in use in various parts of the country, and no reason existed why women should not be employed to manage them —following the profession of engineer as a regular business—an engine requiring far less attention than is given by a nurse-maid or mother to a child.

But to have made the woman's pavilion grandly historic, upon its walls should have been hung the yearly protest of Harriet K. Hunt against taxation without representation; the legal papers served upon the Smith sisters when their Alderny cows were seized and sold for their refusal to pay taxes while unrepresented; the papers held by the city of Worcester for the forced sale of the house and lands of Abby Kelly Foster, the veteran abolitionist, because she refused to pay taxes, giving the same reason our ancestors gave when they resisted taxation; a model of Bunker Hill monument, its foundation laid by Lafayette in 1825, but which remained unfinished nearly twenty years until the famous French *danseuse* Fanny Ellslet, gave the proceeds of an exhibition for that purpose. With these should have been exhibited framed copies of all the laws bearing unjustly upon woman—those which rob her of her name, her earnings, her property, her children, her person; also, the legal papers in the case of Susan B. Anthony, who was tried and fined for seeking to give consent to the laws which governed her; and the decision of Mr. Justice Miller (Chief-Justice Chase dissenting) in the case of Myra Bradwell, denying national protection for woman's civil rights; and the later decision of Chief-Justice Waite of the Supreme Court

against Virginia L. Minor, denying to women national protection for their political rights, decisions in favor of state-rights which imperil the liberties not only of all women, but of every white man in the nation.

Woman's most fitting contributions to the centennial exposition would have been these protests, laws and decisions which show her political slavery. But all this was left for rooms outside of the centennial grounds, upon Chestnut street, where the National Woman Suffrage Association hoisted its flag, made its protests, and wrote the Declaration of Rights of the Women of the United States.

To many thoughtful people it seemed captious and unreasonable for women to complain of injustice in this free land, amidst such universal rejoicings. When the majority of women are seemingly happy, it is natural to suppose that the discontent of the minority is the result of their unfortunate individual idiosyncrasies, and not of adverse influences in their established conditions.

But the history of the world shows that the vast majority in every generation passively accept the conditions into which they are born, while those who demand larger liberties are ever a small, ostracised minority whose claims are ridiculed and ignored. From our stand-point we honor the Chinese women who claim the right to their feet and powers of locomotion, the Hindoo widows who refuse to ascend the funeral pyre of their husbands, the Turkish women who throw off their masks and veils and leave the harem, the Mormon women who abjure their faith and demand monogamic relations; why not equally honor the intelligent minority of American women who protest against the artificial disabilities by which their freedom is limited and their development arrested? That only a few under any circumstances protest against the injustice of long established laws and customs does not disprove the fact of the oppressions, while the satisfaction of the many, if real, only proves their apathy and deeper degradation. That a majority of the women of the United States accept without protest the disabilities that grow out of their disfranchisement, is simply an evidence of their ignorance and cowardice, while the minority who demand a higher political status clearly prove their superior intelligence and wisdom.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXVIII.

NATIONAL CONVENTIONS, HEARINGS AND REPORTS.

1877-1878-1879.

Renewed Appeal for a Sixteenth Amendment—Mrs. Gage Petitions for Removal of Political Disabilities—Ninth Washington Convention, 1877—Jane Grey Swisshelm—Letters, Robert Purvis, Wendell Phillips, Francis E. Abbott—10,000 Petitions Referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections by Special Request of the Chairman, Hon. O. P. Morton, of Indiana—May Anniversary in New York—Tenth Washington Convention, 1878—Frances E. Willard and 30,000 Temperance Women Petition Congress—40,000 Petition for a Sixteenth Amendment—Hearing before the Committee on Privileges and Elections—Madam Dahlgren's Protest—Mrs. Hooker's Hearing on Washington's Birthday—Mary Clemmer's Letter to Senator Wadleigh—His Adverse Report—Favorable Minority Report by Senator Hoar—Thirtieth Anniversary, Unitarian Church, Rochester, N. Y., July 19, 1878—The Last Convention Attended by Lucretia Mott—Letters, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips—Church Resolution Criticised by Rev. Dr. Strong—International Women's Congress in Paris—Washington Convention, 1879—U. S. Supreme Court Opened to Women—May Anniversary at St. Louis—Address of Welcome by Phoebe Couzins—Women in Council Alone—Letter from Josephine Butler, of England—Mrs. Stanton's Letter to *The National Citizen and Ballot-Box.*

WITH the close of the centennial year the new departure under the fourteenth amendment ended. Though defeated at the polls, in the courts, in the national celebration, in securing a plank in the platforms of the Republican and Democratic parties, and in our own conventions—so far as the few were able to rouse the many to simultaneous action—nevertheless a wide-spread agitation had been secured by the presentation of this phase of the question.

Although the unanswerable arguments of statesmen and lawyers in the halls of congress and the Supreme Court of the United States, had alike proved unavailing in establishing the civil and political rights of women on a national basis, their efforts had not been in vain. The trials had brought the question before a new order of minds, and secured able constitutional arguments which were reviewed in many law journals. The equally able congressional debates, reported verbatim, read by a large constituency in every State of the Union, did an educational work on the

Digitized by Google

question of woman's enfranchisement that cannot be overestimated.

But when the final decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Virginia L. Minor made all agitation in that direction hopeless, the National Association returned to its former policy, demanding a sixteenth amendment. The women generally came to the conclusion that if in truth there was no protection for them in the original constitution nor the late amendments, the time had come for some clearly-defined recognition of their citizenship by a sixteenth amendment.

The following appeal and petition were extensively circulated:

To the Women of the United States:

Having celebrated our centennial birthday with a national jubilee, let us now dedicate the dawn of the second century to securing justice to women. For this purpose we ask you to circulate a petition to congress, just issued by the National Association, asking an amendment to the United States Constitution, that shall prohibit the several States from disfranchising citizens on account of sex. We have already sent this petition throughout the country for the signatures of those men and women who believe in the citizen's right to vote.

To see how large a petition each State rolls up, and to do the work as expeditiously as possible, it is necessary that some person in each county should take the matter in charge, urging upon all, thoroughness and haste. * * * The petitions should be returned before January 16, 17, 1877, when we shall hold our Eighth Annual Convention at the capital, and ask a hearing before congress.

Having petitioned our law-makers, State and national, for years, many from weariness have vowed to appeal no more; for our petitions, say they, by the tens of thousands, are piled up in the national archives, unheeded and ignored. Yet it is possible to roll up such a mammoth petition, borne into congress on the shoulders of stalwart men, that we can no longer be neglected or forgotten. Statesmen and politicians alike are conquered by majorities. We urge the women of this country to make now the same united effort for their own rights that they did for the slaves at the South when the thirteenth amendment was pending. Then a petition of over 300,000 was rolled up by the leaders of the suffrage movement, and presented in the Senate by the Hon. Charles Sumner. But the statesmen who welcomed woman's untiring efforts to secure the black man's freedom, frowned down the same demands when made for herself. Is not liberty as sweet to her as to him? Are not the political disabilities of sex as grievous as those of color? Is not a civil-rights bill that shall open to woman the college doors, the trades and professions—that shall secure her personal and property rights, as necessary for her protection as for that of the colored man? And yet the highest judicial authorities have decided that the spirit and letter of our national constitution are not broad enough to protect woman in her political rights; and for the redress of her wrongs

they remand her to the State. If our *Magna Charta* of human rights can be thus narrowed by judicial interpretations in favor of class legislation, then must we demand an amendment that, in clear, unmistakable language, shall declare the equality of all citizens before the law.

Women are citizens, first of the United States, and second of the State wherein they reside; hence, if robbed by State authorities of any right founded in nature or secured by law, they have the same right to national protection against the State, as against the infringements of any foreign power. If the United States government can punish a woman for voting in one State, why has it not the same power to protect her in the exercise of that right in every State? The constitution declares it the duty of congress to guarantee to every State a republican form of government, to every citizen, equality of rights. This is not done in States where women, thoroughly qualified, are denied admission into colleges which their property is taxed to build and endow; where they are denied the right to practice law and are thus debarred from one of the most lucrative professions; where they are denied a voice in the government, and thus, while suffering all the ills that grow out of the giant evils of intemperance, prostitution, war, heavy taxation and political corruption, stand powerless to effect any reform. Prayers, tears, psalm-singing and expostulation are light in the balance compared with that power at the ballot-box that coins opinions into law. If women who are laboring for peace, temperance, social purity and the rights of labor, would take the speediest way to accomplish what they propose, let them demand the ballot in their own hands, that they may have a direct power in the government. Thus only can they improve the conditions of the outside world and purify the home. As political equality is the door to civil, religious and social liberty, here must our work begin.

Constituting, as we do, one-half the people, bearing the burdens of one-half the national debt, equally responsible with man for the education, religion and morals of the rising generation, let us with united voice send forth a protest against the present political status of woman, that shall echo and reëcho through the land. In view of the numbers and character of those making the demand, this should be the largest petition ever yet rolled up in the old world or the new; a petition that shall settle forever the popular objection that "women do not want to vote."

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, *President.*

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Chairman Executive Committee.*

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Corresponding Secretary.*

Tenafly, N. J., November 10, 1876.

To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The undersigned citizens of the United States, residents of the State of———, earnestly pray your honorable bodies to adopt measures for so amending the constitution as to prohibit the several States from disfranchising United States citizens on account of sex.

In addition to the general petition asking for a sixteenth amendment, Matilda Joslyn Gage, this year (1877) sent an individual petition, similar in form to those offered by disfranchised

male citizens, asking to be relieved from her political disabilities. This petition was presented by Hon. Elias W. Leavenworth, of the House of Representatives, member from the thirty-third New York congressional district. It read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Matilda Joslyn Gage, a native born citizen of the United States, and of the State of New York, wherein she resides, most earnestly petitions your honorable body for the removal of her political disabilities and that she may be declared invested with full power to exercise her right of self government at the ballot-box, all State constitutions or statute laws to the contrary notwithstanding.

The above petition was presented January 24, and the following bill introduced February 5:

AN ACT *to relieve the political disabilities of Matilda Joslyn Gage:*

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, that all political disabilities heretofore existing in reference to Matilda Joslyn Gage, of Fayetteville, Onondaga county, State of New York, be removed and she be declared a citizen of the United States, clothed with all the political rights and powers of citizenship, namely: the right to vote and to hold office to the same extent and in the same degree that male citizens enjoy these rights. This act to take effect immediately.

The following year a large number of similar petitions were sent from different parts of the country, the National Association distributing printed forms to its members in the various States. The power of congress to thus enfranchise women upon their individual petitions is as undoubted as the power to grant individual amnesty, to remove the political disabilities of men disfranchised for crime against United States laws, or to clothe foreigners, honorably discharged from the army, with the ballot.

The first convention * after the all-engrossing events of the centennial celebration assembled in Lincoln Hall, Washington, January 16, with a good array of speakers, Mrs. Stanton presiding. After an inspiring song by the Hutchinsons and reports from the

---

* The annual convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association will be held in Lincoln Hall, Washington, D. C., January 16, 17, 1877.

As by repeated judicial decisions, woman's right to vote under the fourteenth amendment has been denied, we must now unitedly demand a sixteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, that shall secure this right to the women of the nation. In certain States and territories where women had already voted, they have been denied the right by legislative action. Hence it must be clear to every thinking mind that this fundamental right of citizenship must not be left to the ignorant majorities in the several States; for unless it is secured everywhere, it is safe nowhere.

We urge all suffrage associations and friends of woman's enfranchisement throughout the country to send delegates to this convention, freighted with mammoth petitions for a sixteenth amendment. Let all other proposed amendments be held in abeyance to the sacred rights of the women of this nation. The most reverent recognition of God in the constitution would be justice and equality for woman.

On behalf of the National Woman Suffrage Association,

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, *President.*

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Chairman Ex. Committee.*

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Corresponding Secretary.*

Tenafly, N. J., November 10, 1876.

various States, Sara Andrews Spencer, chairman of the congressional committee, gave some encouraging facts in regard to the large number of petitions being presented to congress daily, and read many interesting letters from those who had been active in their circulation. Over 10,000 were presented during this last session of the forty-fourth congress. At the special request of the chairman, Senator Morton of Indiana, they were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections; heretofore they had always been placed in the hands of the Judiciary Committee in both Senate and House. A list of committees * was reported by Mrs. Gage which was adopted. Mrs. Swisshelm of Pennsylvania, was introduced. She said:

In 1846 she inherited an estate from her parents, and then she learned the injustice of the husband holding the wife's property. In 1848, however, she got a law passed giving equal rights to both men and women, and everybody decried her for the injury she had done to all homes by thus throwing the apple of discord into families. So in Pennsylvania women now hold property absolutely, and can sell without the consent of the husband. But actually no woman is free. As in the days of slavery the master owned the services, not the body of his slaves, so it is with the wife. The husband owns the services and all that can be earned by his wife. It is quite possible, as things now stand, to legislate a woman out of her home, and yet she cooks, and bakes, and works, and saves, but it all belongs to the man, and if she dies the second wife gets it all, for she always manages him. The extravagance of dress is due alone to-day to the fact that from what woman saves in her own expenses and those of her house she gets no benefit at all, nor do her children, for it goes to the second wife, who, perhaps, turns the children out of doors.

The resolutions called out a prolonged discussion, especially the one on compulsory education, and that finally passed with a few dissenting voices:

WHEREAS one-half of the citizens of the republic being disfranchised are everywhere subjects of legislative caprice, and may be anywhere robbed of their most sacred rights; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to submit a proposition for a sixteenth amendment to the national constitution prohibiting the several States from disfranchising citizens on account of sex.

WHEREAS a monarchial government lives only through the ignorance of the masses, and a republican government can live only through the intelligence of the people; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the duty of Congress to submit to the State legislatures propositions to so amend the Constitution of the United States as to make education compulsory, and to make intelligence a qualification for citizenship and suffrage in the United

* Committees: *Finance*—Sara A. Spencer, Ellen Clark Sargent, Lillie Devereux Blake. *Resolutions*—Matilda Joslyn Gage, Susan B. Anthony, Belva A. Lockwood, Edward M. Davis, C. B. Purvis, M. D., Jane G. Swisshelm. *Business*—John Hutchinson, Mary F. Foster, Rosina M. Parnell, Mary A. S. Carey, Ellen H. Sheldon, S. J. Messer, Susan A. Edson, M. D.

States; said amendments to take effect January 1, 1880, when all citizens of legal age, without distinction of sex, who can read and write the English language, may be admitted to citizenship.

WHEREAS a century of experience has proven that the safety and stability of free institutions and the protection of all United States citizens in the exercise of their inalienable rights and the proper expression of the will of the whole people, are not guaranteed by the present form of the Constitution of the United States; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the duty of the several States to call a national convention to revise the Constitution of the United States, which, notwithstanding its fifteen amendments, does not establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, promote the general welfare, nor secure the blessings of liberty to us and to our posterity.

Resolved, That the thanks of the women of this nation are due to the Rev. Isaac M. See, of the Presbytery of Newark, for his noble stand in behalf of woman's right to preach.

Resolved, That the action of the Presbytery of Newark in condemning the Rev. I. M. See for his liberal course is an indication of the tyranny of the clergy over the consciences of women, and a determination to fetter the spirit of freedom.

Among the many letters to the convention we give the following:

BOSTON, 16th January, 1877.

DEAR FRIEND: These lines will not reach you in time to be of use. I am sorry. But absence and cares must apologize for me. I think you are on the right track—the best method to agitate the question; and I am with you. I mean always to help everywhere and every one. WENDELL PHILLIPS.

Miss ANTHONY.

MANCHESTER, Eng., January 3, 1877.

MY DEAR MISS ANTHONY: It is with great pleasure that I write a word of sympathy and encouragement, on the occasion of your Ninth Annual Convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association.

Beyond wishing you a successful gathering, I will say nothing about the movement in the United States. Women of either country can do nothing directly in promoting the movement in the other; and if they attempt to do so, there is danger that they may hinder and embarrass those who are bearing the burden and heat of the day. The only way in which mutual help can be given is through the women of each nation working to gain ground in their own country. Then, every step so gained, every actual advance of the boundaries of civil and political rights for women is a gain, not only to the country which has secured it, but to the cause of human freedom all over the world.

This year marks the decennial of the movement in the United Kingdom. In the current number of our journal, there is a sketch of the political history of the movement here, which I commend to the attention of your convention, and which I need not repeat. The record will be seen to be one of great and rapid advance in the political rights of women, but there has been an equally marked change in other directions; women's interests in education, and women's questions generally, are treated now with much more respectful consideration than they were ten years ago. We are gratified in believing that much of this consideration is due to the attention roused by our energetic and persistent demand for the suffrage, and in believing that infinitely greater benefits of the same kind will accrue when women shall be in possession of the franchise. Beyond the material gains in legislation, we find a general improvement in the tone of feeling and thought toward women—an approach, indeed, to the sentiment recently expressed by Victor Hugo, that as man was the problem of the eighteenth century, woman is the problem of the nineteenth century. May our efforts to solve this problem lead to a happy issue. Yours truly,

LYDIA E. BECKER.

Digitized by Google

BOSTON, Mass., January 10, 1877.

DEAR MRS. STANTON: It is with some little pain, I confess, that I accept your very courteous invitation to write a letter for your Washington convention on the 19th instant; for what I must say, if I say anything at all, is what I know will be very unacceptable—I fear very displeasing—to the majority of those to whom you will read it. If you conclude that my letter will obstruct, and not facilitate the advancement of the cause you have so faithfully labored for these many years, you have my most cheerful consent to deliver it over to that general asylum of profitless productions—the waste-basket.

Running this risk, however, I have this brief message to send to those who now meet on behalf of woman's full recognition as politically the equal of man, namely: that every woman suffragist who upholds Christianity, tears down with one hand what she seeks to build up with the other—that the Bible sanctions the slavery principle itself, and applies it to woman as the divinely ordained subordinate of man—and that by making herself the great support and mainstay of instituted Christianity, woman rivets the chain of snperstition on her own soul and on man's soul alike, and justifies him in obeying this religion by keeping her in subjection to himself. If Christianity and the Bible are true, woman is man's servant, and ought to be. The Bible gave to negro-slavery its most terrible power—that of summoning the consciences of the Christians to its defense; and the Bible gives to woman-slavery the same terrible power. So plain is this to me that I take it as a mere matter of course, when all the eloquence of the woman-suffrage platform fails to arouse the Christian women of this country to a proper assertion of their rights. What else could one expect? Women will remain contented subjects and subordinates just so long as they remain devoted believers in Christianity; and no amount of argument, or appeal, or agitation can change this fact. If you cannot educate women as a whole out of Christianity, you cannot educate them as a whole into the demand for equal rights.

The reason of this is short: Christianity teaches the rights of God, not the rights of man or woman. You may search the Bible from Genesis to Revelations, and not find one clear, strong, bold affirmation of *human rights as such;* yet it is on human rights as such—on the equality of all individuals, man or woman, with respect to natural rights—that the demand for woman suffrage must ultimately rest. I know I stand nearly alone in this, but I believe from my soul that the woman movement is fundamentally *anti-Christian*, and can find no deep justification but in the ideas, the spirit, and the faith of free religion. Until women come to see this too, and to give their united influence to this latter faith, political power in their hands would destroy even that measure of liberty which free-thinkers of both sexes have painfully established by the sacrifices of many generations. Yet I should vote for woman suffrage all the same, because it is woman's right. Yours very cordially,

FRANCIS E. ABBOT.

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 16, 1877.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: I thank you for your generous recognition of me as an humble co-worker in the cause of equal rights, and regret deeply my inability to be present at this anniversary of your association. I tender to you, however, my hearty congratulations on the marked progress of our cause. Wherever I have been, and with whomsoever I have talked, making equal rights invariably the subject, I find no opposing feeling to the simple and just demands we make for our cause. The chief difficulty in the way is the indifference of the people; they need an awakening. Some Stephen S. Foster or Anna Dickinson should come forward, and with their thunder and lightning, arouse the people from their deadly apathy. I am glad to know that you are to have with you our valued friend, E. M. Davis, of Philadelphia. We are indebted to him more than all besides for whatever of life is found in the movement in Pennsylvania. He has spared neither time, money, nor personal efforts. Hoping you will have abundant success, I am, dear friends, with you and the cause for which you have so nobly labored, a humble and sincere worker. ROBERT PURVIS.

OAKLAND, Cal., January 9, 1877.

To the National Suffrage Convention, Washington, D. C.:

Our incorporated State society has deputed Mrs. Ellen Clark Sargent, the wife of Hon. A. A. Sargent, our fearless champion in the United States Senate, to represent the women of California in your National Convention, and with one so faithful and earnest, we know our cause will be well represented; but there are many among us who would gladly have journeyed to Washington to participate in your councils. Many and radical changes have taken place in the past year favorable to our sex, not the least of which was the nomination and election of several women to the office of county superintendent of common schools, by both the Democratic and Republican parties, in which, however, the Democrats led. Important changes in the civil code favorable to the control of property by married women, have been made by the legislatures during the last four years, through the untiring efforts of Mrs. Sarah Wallis, Mrs. Knox and Mrs. Watson, of Santa Clara county. In our schools and colleges, in every avenue of industry, and in the general liberalization of public opinion there has been marked improvement. Yours very truly,

LAURA DE FORCE GORDON,
Pres. California W. S. S. (Incorporated).

Mrs. Stanton's letter to *The Ballot-Box* briefly sums up the proceedings of the convention:

TENAFLY, N. J., January 24, 1877.

DEAR EDITOR: If the little *Ballot-Box* is not already stuffed to repletion with reports from Washington, I crave a little space to tell your readers that the convention was in all points successful. Lincoln Hall, which seats about fifteen hundred people, was crowded every session. The speaking was good, order reigned, no heart-burnings behind the scenes, and the press vouchsafed "respectful consideration."

The resolutions you will find more interesting and suggestive than that kind of literature usually is, and I ask especial attention to the one for a national convention to revise the constitution, which, with all its amendments, is like a kite with a tail of infinite length still to be lengthened. It is evident a century of experience has so liberalized the minds of the American people, that they have outgrown the constitution adapted to the men of 1776. It is a monarchial document with republican ideas engrafted in it, full of compromises between antagonistic principles. An American statesman remarked that "The civil war was fought to expound the constitution on the question of slavery." Expensive expounding! Instead of further amending and expounding, the real work at the dawn of our second century is to make a new one. Again, I ask the attention of our women to the educational resolution. After much thought it seems to me we should have education compulsory in every State of the Union, and make it the basis of suffrage, a national law, requiring that those who vote after 1880 must be able to read and write the English language. This would prevent ignorant foreigners voting in six months after landing on our shores, and stimulate our native population to higher intelligence. It would dignify and purify the ballot-box and add safety and stability to our free institutions. Mrs. Jane Grey Swisshelm, who had just returned from Europe, attended the convention, and spoke on this subject.

Belva A. Lockwood, who had recently been denied admission to the Supreme Court of the United States, although a lawyer in good practice

Digitized by Google

for three years in the Supreme Court of the District, made a very scathing speech, reviewing the decision of the Court. It may seem to your disfranchised readers quite presumptuous for one of their number to make those nine wise men on the bench, constituting the highest judicial authority in the United States, subjects for ridicule before an audience of the sovereign people; but, when they learn the decision in Mrs. Lockwood's case, they will be reassured as to woman's capacity to cope with their wisdom. "To arrive at the same conclusion with these judges, it is not necessary," said Mrs. Lockwood, "to understand constitutional law, nor the history of English jurisprudence, nor the inductive or deductive modes of reasoning, as no such profound learning or processes of thought were involved in that decision, which was simply this: 'There is no precedent for admitting a woman to practice in the Supreme Court of the United States, hence Mrs. Lockwood's application cannot be considered.'"

On this point Mrs. Lockwood showed that it was the glory of each generation to make its own precedents. As there was none for Eve in the garden of Eden, she argued there need be none for her daughters on entering the college, the church, or the courts. Blackstone—of whose works she inferred the judges were ignorant—gives several precedents for women in the English courts. As Mrs. Lockwood—tall, well-proportioned, with dark hair and eyes, regular features, in velvet dress and train, with becoming indignation at such injustice—marched up and down the platform and rounded out her glowing periods, she might have fairly represented the Italian Portia at the bar of Venice. No more effective speech was ever made on our platform.

Matilda Joslyn Gage, whose speeches are always replete with historical research, reviewed the action of the Republican party toward woman from the introduction of the word "male" into the fourteenth amendment of the constitution down to the celebration of our national birthday in Philadelphia, when the declaration of the mothers was received in contemptuous silence, while Dom Pedro and other foreign dignitaries looked calmly on. Mrs. Gage makes as dark a chapter for the Republicans as Mrs. Lockwood for the judiciary, or Mrs. Blake for the church. Mrs. B. had been an attentive listener during the trial of the Rev. Isaac See before the presbytery of Newark, N. J., hence she felt moved to give the convention a chapter of ecclesiastical history, showing the struggles through which the church was passing with the irrepressible woman in the pulpit. Mrs. Blake's biblical interpretations and expositions proved conclusively that Scott's and Clark's commentaries would at no distant day be superceded by standard works from woman's standpoint. It is not to be supposed that women ever can have fair play as long as men only write and interpret the Scriptures and make and expound the laws. Why would it not be a good idea for women to leave these conservative gentlemen alone in the churches? How sombre they would look with the flowers, feathers, bright ribbons and shawls all gone—black coats only kneeling and standing—and with the deep-toned organ swelling up, the solemn bass voice heard only in awful solitude; not one soprano note to rise above the low, dull wail to fill the arched roof with triumphant melody! One such ex-

Digitized by Google

periment from Maine to California would bring these bigoted presbyteries to their senses.

Miss Phoebe Couzins, too, was at the convention, and gave her new lecture, "A Woman without a Country," in which she shows all that woman has done—from fitting out ships for Columbus, to sharing the toils of the great exposition—without a place of honor in the republic for the living, or a statue to the memory of the dead. Hon. A. G. Riddle and Francis Miller spoke ably and eloquently as usual; the former on the sixteenth amendment and the presidential aspect, modestly suggesting that if twenty million women had voted, they might have been able to find out for whom the majority had cast their ballots. Mr. Miller recommended State action, advising us to concentrate our forces in Colorado as a shorter way to success than constitutional amendments.

His speech aroused Susan B. Anthony to the boiling point; for, if there is anything that exasperates her, it is to be remanded, as she says, to John Morrissey's constituency for her rights. She contends that if the United States authority could punish her for voting in the State of New York, it has the same power to protect her there in the exercise of that right. Moreover, she said, we have two wings to our movement. The American Association is trying the popular-vote method. The National Association is trying the constitutional method, which has emancipated and enfranchised the African and secured to that race all their civil rights. To-day by this method they are in the courts, the colleges, and the halls of legislation in every State in the Union, while we have puttered with State rights for thirty years without a foothold anywhere, except in the territories, and it is now proposed to rob the women of their rights in those localities. As the two methods do not conflict, and what is done in the several States tells on the nation, and what is done by congress reacts again on the States, it must be a good thing to keep up both kinds of agitation.

In the middle of November the National Association sent out thousands of petitions and appeals for the sixteenth amendment, which were published and commented on extensively by the press in every State in the Union. Early in January they began to pour into Washington at the rate of a thousand a day, coming from twenty-six different States. It does not require much wisdom to see that when these petitions were placed in the hands of the respresentatives of their States, a great educational work was accomplished at Washington, and public sentiment there has its legitimate effect throughout the country, as well as that already accomplished in the rural districts by the slower process of circulating and signing the petitions. The present uncertain position of men and parties, has made politicians more ready to listen to the demands of their constituents, and never has woman suffrage been treated with more courtesy in Washington.

To Sara Andrews Spencer we are indebted, for the great labor of receiving, assorting, counting, rolling-up and planning the presentation of the petitions. It was by a well considered *coup d'etat* that, with her brave coadjutors, she appeared on the floor of the House at the moment of ad-

Digitized by Google

journment, and there, without circumlocution, gave each member a petition from his own State. Even Miss Anthony, always calm in the hour of danger, on finding herself suddenly whisked into those sacred enclosures, amid a crowd of stalwart men, spittoons, and scrap-baskets, when brought *vis-a-vis* with our champion, Mr. Hoar, hastily apologized for the intrusion, to which the honorable gentleman promptly replied, "I hope, Madam, yet to see you on this floor, in your own right, and in business hours too." Then and there the work of the next day was agreed on, the members gladly accepting the petitions. As you have already seen, Mr. Hoar made the motion for the special order, which was carried and the petitions presented. Your readers will be glad to know, that Mr. Hoar has just been chosen, by Massachusetts, as her next senator—that gives us another champion in the Senate. As there are many petitions still in circulation, urge your readers to keep sending them until the close of the session, as we want to know how many women are in earnest on this question. It is constantly said, "Women do not want to vote." Ten thousand told our representatives at Washington in a single day that they did! What answer? Yours sincerely, ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

The press commented as follows:

SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT.—The woman suffragists, who had a benefit in the House of Representatives, on Friday, when their petitions were presented, transferred their affections to the Senate on Saturday to witness the presentation of a large number of petitions in that body. It is impossible to tell whether the results desired by the women will follow this concerted action, but it is certain that they have their forces better organized this year than they ever had before, and they have gone to work on a more systematic plan.—[*National Republican.*

SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT IN THE SENATE—THE TEN THOUSAND PETITIONERS ROYALLY TREATED.—That women will, by voting, lose nothing of man's courteous, chivalric attention and respect is admirably proven by the manner in which both houses of congress, in the midst of the most anxious and perplexing presidential conflict in our history, received their appeals from twenty-three States for a sixteenth amendment protecting the rights of women.

In both houses, by unanimous consent, the petitions were presented and read in open session. The speaker of the House gallantly prepared the way yesterday, and the most prominent senators to-day improved the occasion by impressing upon the Senate the importance of the question. Mr. Sargent reminded the senators that there were forty thousand more votes for woman suffrage in Michigan than for the new State constitution, and Mr. Dawes said, upon presenting the petition from Massachusetts, that the question was attracting the attention of both political parties in that State, and he commended it to the early and earnest consideration of the Senate. Mr. Cockrell of Missouri, merrily declared that his petitioners were the most beautiful and accomplished daughters of the State, which of course he felt compelled to do when Miss Couzins' bright eyes were watching the proceedings from the gallery. Mr. Cameron of Pennsylvania, suggested that it would have been better to put them all together and not consume the time of the Senate with so many presentations.

The officers of the National Woman Suffrage Association held a caucus after the adjournment of the Senate, and decided to thank Mr. Cameron for his suggestion, and while they had no anxiety lest senators should consume too much time attending to the interests of women whom they claim to represent, and might reasonably anticipate that ten millions of disfranchised citizens would trouble them considerably with petitions while this injustice continued, yet they would promptly adopt the senator's counsel and roll up such a mammoth petition as the Senate had not yet seen from the thou-

sands of women who had no opportunity to sign these. Accordingly they immediately prepared the announcement for the friends of woman suffrage to send on their names to the chairman of the congressional committee. They naturally feel greatly encouraged by the evident interest of both parties in the proposed sixteenth amendment, and will work with renewed strength to secure the coöperation of the women of the country.—[*Washington Star.*

The time has evidently arrived when demands for a recognition of the personal, civil and political rights of one-half—unquestionably the better half—of the people cannot be laughed down or sneered down, and recent indications are that they cannot much longer be voted down. It was quite clear on Friday and Saturday, when petitions from the best citizens of twenty-three States were presented in House and Senate, that the leaders of the two political parties vied with each other in doing honor to the grave subject proposed for their consideration. The speaker of the House set a commendable example of courtesy to women by proposing that the petitions be delivered in open House, to which there was no objection. The early advocates of equal rights for women—Hoar, Kelley, Banks, Kasson, Lawrence, and Lapham—were, if possible, surpassed in courtesy by those who are not committed, but are beginning to see that a finer element in the body politic would clear the vision, purify the atmosphere and help to settle many vexed questions on the basis of exact and equal justice.

In the Senate the unprecedented courtesy was extended to women of half an hour's time on the floor for the presentation of petitions, exactly alike in form, from twenty-one States, and while this kind of business this session has usually been transacted with an attendance of from seven to ten senators, it was observed that only two out of twenty-three senators who had sixteenth amendment petitions to present were out of their seats. Senator Sargent said the presence of women at the polls would purify elections and give us a better class of public officials, and the State would thus be greatly benefited. The subject was receiving serious consideration in this country and in England. Senator Dawes, in presenting the petition from Massachusetts, said the subject was commanding the attention of both political parties in his own State.

The officers of the National Association, who had been able to give only a few days' time to securing the coöperation of the women of the several States in their present effort, held a caucus after the adjournment of the Senate, and decided to immediately issue a new appeal for a mammoth petition, which would even more decidedly impress the two houses with the importance of protecting the rights of women by a constitutional amendment. Considering the many long days and weeks consumed in both houses in discussing the political rights of the colored male citizens, there is an obvious propriety in giving full and fair consideration to the protection of the rights of wives, mothers and daughters.—[*The National Republican*, January 22, 1877.

The National Association held its anniversary in Masonic Temple, New York, May 24, 1877. Isabella Beecher Hooker, vice-president for Connecticut, called the meeting to order and invited Rev. Olympia Brown to lead in prayer. Mrs. Gage made the annual report of the executive committee. Dr. Clemence S. Lozier of New York was elected president for the coming year. Pledges were made to roll up petitions with renewed energy; and resolutions were duly discussed * and adopted:

WHEREAS, Such minor matters as declaring peace and war, the coining of money, the imposition of tariff, and the control of the postal service, are forbidden the respective States; and whereas, upon the framing of the constitution, it was wisely held

* The speakers at this May anniversary were Mrs. Devereux Blake, Rev. Olympia Brown, Clara Neyman, Helen Cooke, Helen M. Slocum, Mrs. Hooker, Mrs. Gage and Acting-Governor Lee of Wyoming territory.

Digitized by Google

that these property rights would be unsafe under the control of thirteen varying deliberative bodies; and whereas, by a curious anomaly, power over suffrage, the basis and corner-stone of the nation, is held to be under control of the respective States; and

WHEREAS, the experience of a century has shown that the personal right of self-government inhering in each individual, is wholly insecure under the control of thirty-eight varying deliberative bodies; and

WHEREAS, the right of self-government by the use of the ballot inheres in the citizen of the United States; therefore,

Resolved, That it is the immediate and most important duty of the government to secure this right on a national basis to all citizens, independent of sex.

Resolved, That the right of suffrage underlies all other rights, and that in working to secure it women are doing the best temperance, moral reform, educational, and religious work of the age.

Resolved, That we solemnly protest against the recent memorial to congress, from Utah, asking the disfranchisement of the women of that territory, and that we ask of congress that this request, made in violation of the spirit of our institutions, be not granted.

Resolved, That the thanks of the National Woman Suffrage Association are hereby tendered to the late speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. Samuel J. Randall, Pa.; and to Representatives Banks, Mass.; Blair, N. H.; Bland, Mo.; Brown, Kan.; Cox, N. Y.; Eames, R. I.; Fenn, Col.; Hale, Me.; Hamilton, N. J.; Hendee, Vt.; Hoar, Mass.; Holman, Ind.; Jones, N. H.; Kasson, Iowa; Kelley, Pa. Knott, Ky.; Lane, Oregon; Lapham, N. Y.; Lawrence, O.; Luttrel, Cal.; Lynde, Wis.; McCrary, Iowa; Morgan, Mo.; O'Neill, Pa.; Springer, Ill.; Strait, Minn.; Waldron, Mich.; Warren, Conn.; Wm. B. Williams, Mich.; and Senators Allison, Iowa; Bogy, Mo.; Burnside, R. I. (for Conn. and R. I.); Cameron, Pa.; Cameron, Wis.; Chaffee, Col.; Christiancy, Mich.; Cockrell, Mo.; Conkling, N. Y.; Cragin, N. H.; Dawes, Mass.; Dorsey, Ark. (a petition from Me.); Edmunds, Vt.; Frelinghuysen, N. J.; Hamlin, Me.; Kernan, N. Y.; McCreery, Ky.; Mitchell, Oregon; Morrill, Vt.; Morton, Ind.; Oglesby, Ill.; Sargent, Cal.; Sherman, Ohio; Spencer, Ala. (a petition from the District); Thurman, Ohio (a petition from Kansas); Wadleigh, N. H.; Wallace, Pa.; Windom, Minn.; Wright, Iowa, for representing the women of the United States in the presentation of the sixteenth amendment petitions from ten thousand citizens, in open House and Senate, at the last session of congress.

Resolved, That while we recognize with gratitude the opening of many new avenues of labor and usefulness to women, and the amelioration of their condition before the law in many States, we still declare there can be no fair play for women in the world of business until they stand on the same plane of citizenship with their masculine competitors.

Resolved, That in entering the professions and other departments of business heretofore occupied largely by men, the women of to-day should desire to accept the same conditions and tests of excellence with their brothers, and should demand the same standard for men and women in business, art, education, and morals.

Resolved, That the thanks of this association are hereby tendered to the Hon. Geo. F. Hoar of Massachusetts, for rising in his place in the Cincinnati presidential convention, and asking in behalf of the disfranchised women of the United States that the convention grant a hearing to Mrs. Spencer, of Washington, the accredited delegate of the National Woman Suffrage Association.

Great unanimity was reached in these sentiments and the enthusiasm manifested gave promise of earnest labor and more hopeful results. It was felt that there was reason to thank God and take courage.

The day before the opening of the Tenth Washington Convention a caucus was held in the ladies' reception-room * in the Senate wing of the capitol. A roll-call of the delegates developed the fact that every State in the Union would be represented by women now here and *en route*, or by letter. Mrs. Spencer said she had made a request in the proper quarter, that the delegates should be allowed to go on the floor when the Senate was actually in session, and present their case to the senators. She had been met with the statement that such a proceeding was without precedent. Mrs. Hooker suggested that inasmuch as there was a precedent for such a course in the House, the delegates should meet the following Thursday to canvass for votes in the House of Representatives. Another delegate recalled the fact that Mrs. General Sherman and Mrs. Admiral Dahlgren had been admitted upon the floor of the Senate while it was in session, to canvass for votes against woman suffrage.

This agitation resulted in a resolution introduced by Hon. A. A. Sargent, January 10:

WHEREAS, Thousands of women of the United States have petitioned congress for an amendment to the constitution allowing women the right of suffrage; and whereas, many of the representative women of the country favoring such amendment are present in the city and have requested to be heard before the Senate in advocacy of said amendment,

Resolved, That at a session of the Senate, to be held on ———, said representative women, or such of them as may be designated for that purpose, may be heard before the Senate; but for one hour only.

Mr. EDMUNDS demanded the regular order.

Mr. SARGENT advocated the resolution, and urged immediate action, as delay would detain the women in the city at considerable expense to them. He thought the question not so intricate that senators require time for consideration whether or not the women should be heard.

Mr. EDMUNDS said there was a rule of long standing that forbids any person appearing before the Senate. There was much to be said in favor of the petitions, but it was against the logic of the resolution that the petitioners required more than was accorded any others. He, therefore, insisted on his demand for the regular order.

Mr. SARGENT gave notice that he would call up his resolution tomorrow, and reminded the senators that no rule was so sacred that it could not be set aside by unanimous consent.

On the next day there was a lively discussion, Senators Edmunds, Thurman and Conkling insisting there was no precedent; Mr. Sargent, assisted by Senators Burnside, Anthony and Dawes,

* This reception-room, a great convenience to the ladies visiting the capitol, has since been removed; and a small, dark, inaccessible room on the basement floor set aside for their use.

Digitized by Google

reminding them of several occasions when the Senate had extended similar courtesies. The resolution was voted down—31 to 13.*

Hon. Wm. D. Kelly, of Pennsylvania, performed like service in the House:

Mr. KELLY asked leave to offer a resolution, reciting that petitions were about to be presented to the House of Representatives from citizens of thirty-five States of the Union, asking for the adoption of an amendment to the constitution to prohibit the disfranchisement of any citizen of any State; and that there be a session of the House on Saturday, January 12, at which time the advocates of the constitutional amendment may be heard at the bar. These petitions ask the House to originate a movement which it cannot consumate, but which it can only submit to the States for their action. The resolution only asks that the House will hear a limited number of the advocates of this amendment, who are now in the city, and on a day when there is not likely to be a session for business. They only ask the privilege of stating the grounds of their belief why the constitution should be amended in the direction they indicate. Many of these ladies who petition are tax-payers, and they believe their rights have been infringed upon.

Mr. CRITTENDEN of Missouri, objected, and the resolution was not entertained.

This refusal to women pleading for their own freedom was the more noticeable, as not only had Mesdames Sherman and Dahlgren been heard upon the floor of the Senate in opposition, but the floor of the House was shortly after granted to Charles Stewart Parnell, M. P., that he might plead the cause of oppressed Ireland. The Washington *Union* of January 11, 1878, largely sustained by federal patronage, commented as follows:

To allow the advocates of woman suffrage to plead their cause on the floor of the Senate, as proposed yesterday by Mr. Sargent, would be a decided innovation upon the established usages of parliamentary bodies. If the privilege were granted in this case it would next be claimed by the friends and the enemies of the silver bill, by the supporters and opponents of resumption, by hard money men and soft money men, by protectionists and free-traders, by labor-reformers, prohibitionists and the Lord knows whom besides. In fact, the admission of the ladies to speak on the floor of the Senate would be the beginning of lively times in that body.

The convention was held in Lincoln Hall, January, 8, 9, 1878. The house was filled to overflowing at the first session. A large

* *Yeas*—Anthony, Bruce, Burnside, Cameron of Wis., Dawes, Ferry, Hoar, Matthews, Mitchell, Rollins, Sargent, Saunders, Teller—13.

Nays—Bailey, Bayard, Beck, Booth, Butler, Christiancy, Cockrell, Coke, Conkling, Davis of W. Va., Eaton, Edmunds, Eustis, Grover, Hamlin, Harris, Hereford, Hill, Howe, Kernan, Kirkwood, Lamar, McDonald, McMillan, McPherson, Morgan, Plumb, Randolph, Saulsbury, Thurman, Wadleigh—31.

Digitized by Google

number of representative women occupied the platform.* In opening the meeting the president, Dr. Clemence Lozier, gave a résumé of the progress of the cause. Mrs. Stanton made an argument on "National Protection for National Citizens."† Mrs. Lockwood presented the following resolutions, which called out an amusing debate on the "man idea"—that he can best represent the home, the church, the State, the industries, etc., etc.:

Resolved, That the president of this convention appoint a committee to select three intelligent women who shall be paid commissioners to the Paris exposition; and also six other women who shall be volunteer commissioners to said exposition to represent the industries of American women.

Resolved, That to further this object the committee be instructed to confer with the President, the Secretary of State, and Commissioner McCormick.

A committee was appointed‡ and at once repaired to the white-house, where they were pleasantly received by President Hayes. After learning the object of their visit, the president named the different classes of industries for which no commissioners had been appointed, asked the ladies to nominate their candidates, and assured them he would favor a representation by women.

Miss JULIA SMITH of Glastonbury, Conn., the veteran defender of the maxim of our fathers, "no taxation without representation," narrated the experience of herself and her sister Abby with the tax-gatherers. They attended the town-meeting and protested against unjust taxation, but finally their cows went into the treasury to satisfy the tax-collector.

ELIZABETH BOYNTON HARBERT of the Chicago *Inter-Ocean*, spoke on the temperance work being done in Chicago, in connection with the advocacy of the sixteenth amendment.

LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE reviewed the work in New York in getting the bill through the legislature to appoint women on school boards, which was finally vetoed by Governor Robinson.

Dr. MARY THOMPSON of Oregon, and Mrs. CROMWELL of Arkansas, gave interesting reports from their States, relating many laughable encounters with the opposition.

ROBERT PURVIS of Philadelphia, read a letter from the suffragists of Pennsylvania, in which congratulations were extended to the convention.

MARY A. S. CAREY, a worthy representative of the District of Columbia, the first colored woman that ever edited a newspaper in the United States, and who had been a worker in the cause for twenty years, ex-

* Grace Greenwood, Clara Barton, Abby Hutchinson Patton, Mrs. Juan Lewis, Mrs. Morgan of Mississippi, Dr. Mary A. Thompson of Oregon, Marilla M. Ricker, Julia E. Smith, Rev. Olympia Brown, Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Lockwood, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Stanton, Dr. Lozier and others.

† This argument was subsequently given before the Committee on Privileges and Elections and will be found on page 80.

‡ The members of the committee were Belva A. Lockwood, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Mary A. Thompson, M. D., Marilla M. Ricker, Elizabeth Boynton Harbert.

Digitized by Google

pressed her views on the question, and said the colored women would support whatever party would allow them their rights, be it Republican or Democratic.

Rev. OLYMPIA BROWN believed that a proper interpretation of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments did confer suffrage on women. But men don't so understand it, and as a consequence when Mahomet would not come to the mountain the mountain must go to Mahomet. She said the day was coming, and rapidly, too, when women would be given suffrage. There were very few now who did not acknowledge the justice of it.

ISABELLA BEECHER HOOKER gave her idea on "A Reconstructed Police," showing how she would rule a police force if in her control. Commencing with the location of the office, she proceeded with her list of feminine and masculine officers, the chief being herself. She would have a superintendent as aid, with coördinate powers, and, besides the police force proper, which she would form of men and women in equal proportions; she would have matrons in charge of all station-houses. Her treatment of vagrants would be to wash, feed, and clothe them, make them stitch, wash and iron, take their history down for future reference, and finally turn them out as skilled laborers. The care of vagrant children would form an item in her system.

Mrs. LAWRENCE of Massachusetts said the country is in danger, and like other republics, unless taken care of, will perish by its own vices. She said twelve hundred thousand men and women of this country now stand with nothing to do, because their legislators of wealth were working not for the many, but the few, drunkenness and vice being superinduced by such a state of things. She insisted that women were to blame for much of the evil of the world—for bringing into life children who grow up in vice from their inborn tendencies.

Dr. CAROLINE B. WINSLOW of Washington, referred to the speech of Mrs. Lawrence, saying she hoped God would bless her for having the courage to speak as she did. There is no greater reform than for man and woman to be true to the marital relations.

BELVA A. LOCKWOOD said the only way for women to get their rights is to take them. If necessary let there be a domestic insurrection. Let young women refuse to marry, and married women refuse to sew on buttons, cook, and rock the cradle until their liege-lords acknowledge the rights they are entitled to. There were more ways than one to conquer a man; and women, like the strikers in the railroad riots, should carry their demands all along the line. She dwelt at length upon the refusal of the courts in allowing Lavinia Dundore to become a constable, and asked why she should not be appointed.

The Rev. OLYMPIA BROWN said that if they wanted wisdom and prosperity in the nation, health and happiness in the home, they must give woman the power to purify her surroundings; the right to make the outside world fit for her children to live in. Who are more interested than mothers in the sanitary condition of our schools and streets, and in the moral atmosphere of our towns and cities?

Digitized by Google

Marshal FREDERICK DOUGLASS said his reluctance to come forward was not due to any lack of interest in the subject under discussion. For thirty years he had believed in human rights to all men and women. Nothing that has ever been proposed involved such vital interests as the subject which now invites attention. When the negro was freed the question was asked if he was capable of voting intelligently. It was answered in this way: that if a sober negro knows as much as a drunken white man he is capable of exercising the elective franchise.

LAVINIA C. DUNDORE, introdued as the lady who had made application for an appointment as a constable and been refused, made a pithy address, in which she alluded to her recent disappointment.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE spoke of the influence of the church on woman's liberties, and then referred to a large number of law books—ancient and modern, ecclesiastical and lay—in which the liberties of woman were more or less abridged; the equality of sexes which obtained in Rome before the Christian era, and the gradual discriminatian in favor of men which crept in with the growth of the church.

Mrs. DEVEREUX BLAKE said there is no aspect of this question that strikes us so forcibly as the total ignoring of women by public men. However polite they may be in private life, when they come to public affairs they seem to forget that women exist. The men who framed the last amendment to the constitution seemed to have wholly forgotten that women existed or had rights..... Huxley said in reply to an inquiry is to woman suffrage, "Of course I'm in favor of it. Does it become us to lay additional burdens on those who are already overweighted?" It is always the little men who oppose us; the big-hearted men help us along. All in this audience are of the broad-shouldered type, and I hope all will go out prepared to advocate our principles. In reply to the objection that women do not need the right to vote because men represent them so well, she asked if any man in the audience ever asked his wife how he should vote, and told him to stand up if there was such a one. [Here a young man in the back part of the hall stood up amidst loud applause.]

The various resolutions were discussed at great length and adopted, though much difference of opinion was expressed on the last, which demands that intelligence shall be made the basis of suffrage:

Resolved, That the National Constitution should be so amended as to secure to United States citizens at home the same protection for their individual rights against State tyranny, as is now guaranteed everywhere against foreign aggressions.

Resolved, That the civil and political rights of the educated tax-paying women of this nation should take precedence of all propositions and debates in the present congress as to the future status of the Chinese and Indians under the flag of the United States.

WHEREAS, The essential elements of justice are already recognized in the constitution; and, whereas, our fathers proposed to establish a purely secular government in which all forms of religion should be equally protected, therefore,

Resolved, That it is preëminently unjust to tax the property of widows and spinsters to its full value, while the clergy are made a privileged class by exempting from taxa-

Digitized by Google

tion $1,500 of their property in some States, while in all States parsonages and other church property, amounting to millions of dollars, are exempted, which, if fairly taxed, would greatly lighten the national debt, and thereby the burdens of the laboring masses.

Resolved, That thus to exempt one class of citizens, one kind of property, from taxation, at the expense of all others, is a great national evil, in a moral as well as a financial point of view. It is an assumption that the church is a more important institution than the family; that the influence of the clergy is of more vital consequence in the progress of civilization than that of the women of this republic; from which we emphatically dissent.

Resolved, That universal education is the true basis of universal suffrage; hence the several States should so amend their constitutions as to make education compulsory, and, as a stimulus to the rising generation, declare that after 1885 all who exercise the right of suffrage must be able to read and write the English language. For, while the national government should secure the equal right of suffrage to all citizens, the State should regulate its exercise by proper attainable qualifications.

On January 10, 1878, our champion in the Senate, Hon. A. A. Sargent, of California, by unanimous consent, presented the following joint resolution, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

JOINT RESOLUTION *proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.*—

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, two-thirds of each House concurring therein, That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of the said constitution, namely:

ARTICLE 16, SEC. 1.—The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

SEC. 2.—Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

The Committee on Privileges and Elections granted hearings to the National Association on January 11, 12, when the delegates,* representing the several States, made their respective arguments and appeals. Clemence S. Lozier, M. D., president of the association, first addressed the committee and read the following extract from a recent letter from Victor Hugo:

Our ill-balanced society seems as if it would take from woman all that nature had endowed her with. In our codes there is something to recast. It is what I call the woman-law. Man has had his law; he has made it for himself. Woman has only the law of man. She by this law is civilly a minor and morally a slave. Her education is embued with this twofold character of inferiority. Hence many sufferings to her which man must justly share. There must be reform here, and it will be to the benefit of civilization, truth, and light.

* At this hearing the speakers were Clemence S. Lozier, M. D., New York; Julia E. Smith, Connecticut; Elizabeth Cady Stanton, New Jersey; Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Illinois; Matilda Joslyn Gage, New York; Priscilla Rand Lawrence, Massachusetts; Rev. Olympia Brown, Connecticut; Mary A. Thompson, M. D., Oregon; Mary Powers Filley, New Hampshire; Lillie Devereux Blake, New York; Sara Andrews Spencer, District of Columbia; Isabella Beecher Hooker, Connecticut; Mary A. Stewart, Delaware.

In concluding, Dr. Lozier said: I have now the honor to introduce Miss Julia E. Smith, of Glastonbury, Conn., who will speak to you concerning the resistance of her sister and herself to the payment of taxes in her native town, on the ground that they are unrepresented in all town meetings, and therefore have no voice in the expenditure of the taxes which they are compelled to pay.

Miss SMITH said: *Gentlemen of the Committee*—This is the first time in my life that I have trod these halls, and what has brought me here? I say, oppression—oppression of women by men. Under the law they have taken from us $2,000 worth of meadow-land, and sold it for taxes of less than $50, and we were obliged to redeem it, for we could not lose the most valuable part of our farm. They have come into our house and said, "You must pay so much; we must execute the laws"; and we are not allowed to have a voice in the matter, or to modify laws that are odious.

I have come to Washington, as men cannot address you for us. We have no power at all; we are totally defenseless. [Miss Smith then read two short letters written by her sister Abby to the Springfield *Republican*.] These tell our brief story, and may I not ask, gentlemen, that they shall so plead with you that you will report to the Senate unanimously in favor of the sixteenth amendment, which we ask in order that the women of these United States who shall come after us may be saved the desecration of their homes which we have suffered, and our country may be relieved from the disgrace of refusing representation to that half of its people that men call the better half, because it includes their wives and daughters and mothers?

ELIZABETH BOYNTON HARBERT, vice-president for Illinois: *Gentlemen of the Committee*—We recognize your duty as men intrusted with the control and guidance of the government to carefully weigh every phase of this momentous question. Has the time arrived when it will be safe and expedient to make a practical application of these great principles of our government to one-half of the governed, one-half of the citizens of the United States? The favorite argument of the opposition has been that women are represented by men, hence have no cause for complaint. Any careful student of the progress of liberty must admit that the only possible method for securing justice to the represented is for their representatives to be made entirely responsible to their constituents, and promptly removable by them. We are only secure in delegating power when we can dictate its use, limit the same, or revoke it. How many of your honorable committee would vote to make the presidency an office for life, said office to descend to the heirs in a male line forever, with no reserved power of impeachment? Yet you would be more fairly represented than are American women, since they have never elected their representatives. So far as women are concerned you are self-constituted rulers. We cannot hope for complete representation while we are powerless to recall, impeach, or punish our representatives. We meet with a case in point in the history of Virginia. Bancroft gives us the following quotation from the official records:

Digitized by Google

The freedom of elections was further impaired by "frequent false returns," made by the sheriffs. Against these the people had no sufficient redress, for the sheriffs were responsible neither to them nor to officers of their appointment. And how could a more pregnant cause of discontent exist in a country where the elective franchise was cherished as the dearest civil privilege?—If land is to be taxed, none but landholders should elect the legislature.—The other freemen, who are the more in number, may refuse to be bound by those laws in which they have no representation, and we are so well acquainted with the temper of the people that we have reason to believe they had rather pay their taxes than lose that privilege.

Would those statesmen have dared to tax those landholders and yet deny them the privilege of choosing their representatives? And if, forsooth, they had, would not each one of you have declared such act unconstitutional and unjust? We are the daughters of those liberty-loving patriots. Their blood flows in our veins, and in view of the rocognized physiological fact that special characteristics are transmitted from fathers to daughters, do you wonder that we tax-paying, American-born citizens of these United States are here to protest in the name of liberty and justice? We recognize, however, that you are not responsible for the present political condition of women, and that the question confronting you, as statesmen called to administer justice under existing conditions, is, "What are the capacities of this great class for self-government?" You have cautiously summoned us to adduce proof that the ballot in the hands of women would prove a help, not a hindrance; would bring wings, not weights.

First, then, we ask you in the significant name of history to read the record of woman as a ruler from the time when Deborah judged Israel, and the land had rest and peace forty years, even down to this present when Victoria Regina, the Empress Queen, rules her vast kingdom so ably that we sometimes hear American men talk about a return "to the good old ways of limited monarchy," with woman for a ruler. John Stuart Mill, after studious research, testifies as follows:

When to queens and emperors we add regents and viceroys of provinces, the list of women who have been eminent rulers of mankind swells to a great length. The fact is so undeniable that some one long ago tried to retort the argument by saying that queens are better than kings, because under kings women govern, but under queens, men. Especially is her wonderful talent for governing evinced in Asia. If a Hindoo principality is strongly, vigilantly, and economically governed; if order is preserved without oppression; if cultivation is extending, and the people prosperous, in three cases out of four that principality is under a woman's rule. This fact, to me an entirely unexpected one, I have collected from a long official knowledge of Hindoo governments. There are many such instances; for though by Hindoo institutions a woman cannot reign, she is the legal regent of a kingdom during the minority of the heir—and minorities are frequent, the lives of the male rulers being so often prematurely terminated through their inactivity and excesses. When we consider that these princesses have never been seen in public, have never conversed with any man not of their own family, except from behind a curtain; that they do not read, and if they did, there is no book in their languages which can give them the smallest instruction on political affairs, the example they afford of the natural capacity of women for government is very striking.

In view of these facts, does it not appear that if there is any one distinctively feminine characteristic, it is the mother-instinct for government?

But now with clearer vision we reread the record of the past. True, we find no Raphael or Beethoven, no Phidias or Michael Angelo among women. No woman has painted the greatest picture, carved the finest statue, composed the noblest oratorio or opera. Not many women's names appear after Joan of Arc's in the long list of warriors; but, as a ruler, woman stands to-day the peer of man.

While man has rendered such royal service in the realm of art, woman has not been idle. Infinite wisdom has intrusted to her the living, breathing marble or canvas, and with smiles and tears, prayers and songs has she patiently wrought developing the latent possibilities of the divine Christ-child, the infant Washington, the baby Lincoln. Ah! since God and men have intrusted to woman the weightiest responsibility known to earth, the development and education of the human soul, need you fear to intrust her with citizenship? Is the ballot more precious than the soul of your child? If it is safe in the home, in the school-room, the Sunday-school, to place in woman's hands the education of your children, is it not safe to allow that mother to express her choice in regard to which one of these sons, her boys whom she has taught and nursed, shall make laws for her guidance?

Just here, in imagination, is heard the question, "How much help could we expect from women on financial questions? We accept the masculine idea of woman's mathematical deficiencies. We have had slight opportunity for discovering the best proportions of a silver dollar, owing to the fact that the family specimens have been zealously guarded by the male members; and yet, we may have some latent possibilities in that direction, since already the "brethren" in our debt-burdened churches wail out from the depths of masculine indebtedness and interest-tables, "Our sisters, we pray you come over and help us!" And, in view of the fact of the present condition of finances, in view of the fact of the enormous taxes you impose upon us, can you look us calmly in the face and assert that matters might, would, should, or could have been worse, even though Julia Ward Howe, Mary A. Livermore, or Elizabeth Cady Stanton, had voted on the silver bill?

A moment since I referred to the great responsibilities of motherhood, and doubtless your mental comment was, "Yes, that is woman's peculiar sphere; there she should be content to remain." It *is* our sphere—beautiful, glorious, almost infinite in its possibilities. We accept the work; we only ask for opportunity to perform it. The sphere has enlarged, that is all. There has been a new revelation. That historic "first gun" proclaimed a wonderful message to the daughters of America; for, when the smoke of the cannonading had lifted, the entire horizon of woman was broadened, illuminated, glorified. On that April morn, when a nation of citizens suddenly sprang into an army of warriors, with a patriotism as intense, a consecration as true, American women quietly assumed their vacated places and became citizens. New boundaries were defined. A Mary Somerville or Maria Mitchell seized the telescope and alone with God and the stars, cast a new horoscope for woman. And the new truth, electrifying, glorifying American womanhood to-day, is the discovery that the

Digitized by Google

State is but the larger family, the nation the old homestead, and that in this national home there is a room and a corner and a duty for "mother." A duty recognized by such a statesman as John Adams, who wrote to his wife in regard to her mother:

Your mother had a clear and penetrating understanding and a profound judgment, as well as an honest, a friendly and charitable heart. There is one thing, however, which you will forgive me if I hint to you. Let me ask you rather if you are not of my opinion. Were not her talents and virtues too much confined to private, social and domestic life? My opinion of the duties of religion and morality comprehends a very extensive connection with society at large and the great interests of the public. Does not natural morality and, much more, Christian benevolence make it our indispensable duty to endeavor to serve our fellow-creatures to the utmost of our power in promoting and supporting those great political systems and general regulations upon which the happiness of multitudes depends? The benevolence, charity, capacity and industry which exerted in private life would make a family, a parish or a town happy, employed upon a larger scale and in support of the great principles of virtue and freedom of political regulations, might secure whole nations and generations from misery, want and contempt.

Intense domestic life is selfish. The home evidently needs fathers as much as mothers. Tender, wise fatherhood is beautiful as motherhood, but there are orphaned children to be cared for. These duties to the State and nation as mothers, true to the highest needs of our children, we dare not ignore; and the nation cannot much longer afford to have us ignore them.

As statesmen, walking on the shore piled high with the "drift-wood of kings," the wrecks of nations and governments, you have discovered the one word emblazoned as an epitaph on each and every one, "Luxury, luxury, luxury!" You have hitherto placed a premium upon woman's idleness, helplessness, dependence. The children of most of our fashionable women are being educated by foreign nurses. How can you expect them to develop into patriotic American statesmen? For the sake of country I plead—for the sake of a responsible, exalted womanhood; for the sake of a purer womanhood; for home and truth, and native land. As a daughter, with holiest, tenderest, most grateful memories clinging to the almost sacred name of father; as a wife, receiving constant encouragement, support, and coöperation from one who has revealed to her the genuine nobility of true manhood; as a mother, whose heart still thrills at the first greeting from her little son; and as a sister, watching with intense interest the entrance of a brother into the great world of work, I could not be half so loyal to woman's cause were it not a synonym for the equal rights of humanity—a diviner justice for all!

With one practical question I rest my case. The world objected to woman's entrance into literature, the pulpit, the lyceum, the college, the school. What has she wrought? Our wisest thinkers and historians assert that literature has been purified. Poets and judges at international collegiate contests award to woman's thought the highest prize. Miss Lucia Peabody received upon the occasion of her second election to the Boston school board the highest vote ever polled for any candidate. Since woman has proved faithful over a few things, need you fear to summon her to your side to assist you in executing the will of

Digitized by Google

the nation? And now, yielding to none in intense love of womanhood; standing here beneath the very dome of the national capitol overshadowed by the old flag; with the blood of the revolutionary patriots coursing through my veins; as a native-born, tax-paying American citizen, I ask equality before the law.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON said: *Gentlemen of the Committee:* In appearing before you to ask for a sixteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, permit me to say that with the Hon. Charles Sumner, we believe that our constitution, fairly interpreted, already secures to the humblest indiyidual all the rights, privileges and immunities of American citizens. But as statesmen differ in their interpretations of constitutional law as widely as they differ in their organizations, the rights of every class of citizens must be clearly defined in concise, unmistakable language. All the great principles of liberty declared by the fathers gave no protection to the black man of the republic for a century, and when, with higher light and knowledge his emancipation and enfranchisement were proclaimed, it was said that the great truths set forth in the prolonged debates of thirty years on the individual rights of the black man, culminating in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the constitution, had no significance for woman. Hence we ask that this anomalous class of beings, not recognized by the supreme powers as either "persons" or "citizens" may be defined and their rights declared in the constitution.

In the adjustment of the question of suffrage now before the people of this country for settlement, it is of the highest importance that the organic law of the land should be so framed and construed as to work injustice to none, but secure as far as possible perfect political equality among all classes of citizens. In determining your right and power to legislate on this question, consider what has been done already.

As the national constitution declares that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside," it is evident: *First*—That the immunities and privileges of American citizenship, however defined, are national in character, and paramount to all State authority. *Second*—That while the constitution leaves the qualification of electors to the several States, it nowhere gives them the right to deprive any citizen of the elective franchise; the State may regulate but not abolish the right of suffrage for any class. *Third*—As the Constitution of the United States expressly declares that no State shall make or enforce any law that shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, those provisions of the several State constitutions that exclude citizens from the franchise on account of sex, alike violate the spirit and letter of the Federal constitution. *Fourth*—As the question of naturalization is expressly withheld from the States, and as the States would clearly have no right to deprive of the franchise naturalized citizens, among whom women are expressly included, still more clearly have they no right to deprive native-born women-citizens of the right.

Let me give you a few extracts from the national constitution upon which these propositions are based:

Digitized by Google

Preamble: We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution.

This is declared to be a government "of the people." All power, it is said, centers in the people. Our State constitutions also open with the words, "We, the people." Does any one pretend to say that men alone constitute races and peoples? When we say parents, do we not mean mothers as well as fathers? When we say children, do we not mean girls as well as boys? When we say people, do we not mean women as well as men? When the race shall spring, Minerva-like, from the brains of their fathers, it will be time enough thus to ignore the fact that one-half the human family are women. Individual rights, individual conscience and judgment are our great American ideas, the fundamental principles of our political and religious faith. Men may as well attempt to do our repenting, confessing, and believing, as our voting—as well represent us at the throne of grace as at the ballot-box.

ARTICLE 1, SEC. 9.—No bill of attainder, or *ex post facto* law shall be passed; no title of nobility shall be granted by the Uuited States.

SEC. 10.—No State shall pass any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.

Notwithstanding these provisions of the constitution, bills of attainder have been passed by the introduction of the word "male" into all the State constitutions denying to woman the right of suffrage, and thereby making sex a crime. A citizen disfranchised in a republic is a citizen attainted. When we place in the hands of one class of citizens the right to make, interpret and execute the law for another class wholly unrepresented in the government, we have made an order of nobility.

ARTICLE 4, SEC. 2.—The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

The elective franchise is one of the privileges secured by this section approved in Dunham *vs*, Lamphere (3 Gray Mass. Rep., 276), and Bennett *vs*. Boggs (Baldwin's Rep., p. 72, Circuit Court U. S.).

ARTICLE 4, SEC. 4.—The United States shall gurantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government.

How can that form of government be called republican in which one-half the people are forever deprived of all participation in its affairs?

ARTICLE 6.—This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, ... shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

ARTICLE 14, SEC. 1.—All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States. . . . . No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States.

In the discussion of the enfranchisement of woman, suffrage is now claimed by one class of thinkers as a privilege based upon citizenship and secured by the Constitution of the United States, as by lexicographers as

Digitized by Google

well as by the constitution itself, the definition of citizen includes women as well as men. No State can rightfully deprive a woman-citizen of the United States of any fundamental right which is hers in common with all other citizens. The States have the right to regulate, but not to prohibit the elective franchise to citizens of the United States. Thus the States may determine the qualifications of electors. They may require the elector to be of a certain age—to have had a fixed residence—to be of sane mind and unconvicted of crime,—because these are qualifications or conditions that all citizens, sooner or later, may attain. But to go beyond this, and say to one-half the citizens of the State, notwithstanding you possess all of these qualifications, you shall never vote, is of the very essence of despotism. It is a bill of attainder of the most odious character.

A further investigation of the subject will show that the constitutions of all the States, with the exception of Virginia and Massachusetts, read substantially alike. "White male citizens" shall be entitled to vote, and this is supposed to exclude all other citizens. There is no direct exclusion except in the two States above named. Now the error lies in supposing that an enabling clause is necessary at all. The right of the people of a State to participate in a government of their own creation requires no enabling clause, neither can it be taken from them by implication. To hold otherwise would be to interpolate in the constitution a prohibition that does not exist.

In framing a constitution, the people are assembled in their sovereign capacity, and being possessed of all rights and powers, what is not surrendered is retained. Nothing short of a direct prohibition can work a deprivation of rights that are fundamental. In the language of John Jay to the people of New York, urging the adoption of the constitution of the United States: "Silence and blank paper neither give nor take away anything." And Alexander Hamilton says (*Federalist*, No. 83):

> Every man of discernment must at once perceive the wide difference between silence and abolition. The mode and manner in which the people shall take part in the government of their creation may be prescribed by the constitution, but the right itself is antecedent to all constitutions. It is inalienable, and can neither be bought nor sold nor given away.

But even if it should be held that this view is untenable, and that women are disfranchised by the several State constitutions, directly or by implication, then I say that such prohibitions are clearly in conflict with the Constitution of the United States and yield thereto.

Another class of thinkers, equally interested in woman's enfranchisement, maintain that there is, as yet, no power in the United States Constitution to protect the rights of all United States citizens, in all latitudes and longitudes, and in all conditions whatever. When the constitution was adopted, the fathers thought they had secured national unity. This was the opinion of Southern as well as Northern statesmen. It was supposed that the question of State rights was then forever settled. Hon. Charles Sumner, speaking on this point in the United States Senate, March 7, 1866, said the object of the constitution was to ordain, under the authority of the people, a national government possessing unity and

Digitized by Google

power. The confederation had been merely an agreement "between the States," styled, "a league of firm friendship." Found to be feeble and inoperative through the pretension of State rights, it gave way to the constitution which, instead of a "league," created a "union," in the name of the people of the United States. Beginning with these inspiring and enacting words, "We, the people," it was popular and national. Here was no concession to State rights, but a recognition of the power of the people, from whom the constitution proceeded. The States are acknowledged; but they are all treated as component parts of the Union in which they are absorbed under the constitution, which is the supreme law. There is but one sovereignty, and that is the sovereignty of the United States. On this very account the adoption of the constitution was opposed by Patrick Henry and George Mason. The first exclaimed, "That this is a consolidated government is demonstrably clear; the question turns on that poor little thing, 'We, the people,' instead of the States." The second exclaimed, "Whether the constitution is good or bad, it is a national government, and no longer a confederation." But against this powerful opposition the constitution was adopted in the name of the people of the United States. Throughout the discussions, State rights was treated with little favor. Madison said: "The States are only political societies, and never possessed the right of sovereignty." Gerry said: "The States have only corporate rights." Wilson, the philanthropic member from Pennsylvania, afterward a learned Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States and author of the "Lectures on Law," said: "Will a regard to State rights justify the sacrifice of the rights of men? If we proceed on any other foundation than the last, our building will neither be solid nor lasting."

Those of us who understand the dignity, power and protection of the ballot, have steadily petioned congress for the last ten years to secure to the women of the republic the exercise of their right to the elective franchise. We began by asking a sixteenth amendment to the national constitution. March 15, 1869, the Hon. George W. Julian submitted a joint resolution to congress, to enfranchise the women of the republic, by proposing a sixteenth amendment:

ARTICLE 16.—The right of suffrage in the United States shall be based on citizenship, and shall be regulated by Congress, and all citizens of the United States, whether native or naturalized, shall enjoy this right equally, without any distinction or discrimination whatever founded on sex.

While the discussion was pending for the emancipation and enfranchisement of the slaves of the South, and popular thought led back to the consideration of the fundamental principles of our government, it was clearly seen that all the arguments for the civil and political rights of the African race applied to women also. Seeing this, some Republicans stood ready to carry these principles to their logical results. Democrats, too, saw the drift of the argument, and though not in favor of extending suffrage to either black men, or women, yet, to embarrass Republican legislation, it was said, they proposed amendments for woman suffrage to all bills brought forward for enfranchising the negroes.

Digitized by Google

And thus, during the passage of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, and the District suffrage bill, the question of woman suffrage was often and ably discussed in the Senate and House, and received both Republican and Democratic votes in its favor. Many able lawyers and judges gave it as their opinion that women as well as Africans were enfranchised by the fourteenth and fifteenth Amendments. Accordingly, we abandoned, for the time being, our demand for a sixteenth amendment, and pleaded our right of suffrage, as already secured by the fourteenth amendment—the argument lying in a nut-shell. For if, as therein asserted, all persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens of the United States; and if a citizen, according to the best authorities, is one possessed of all the rights and privileges of citizenship, namely, the right to make laws and choose lawmakers, women, being persons, must be citizens, and therefore entitled to the rights of citizenship, the chief of which is the right to vote.

Accordingly, women tested their right, registered and voted—the inspectors of election accepting the argument, for which inspectors and women alike were arrested, tried and punished; the courts deciding that although by the fourteenth amendment they were citizens, still, citizenship did not carry with it the right to vote. But granting the premise of the Supreme Court decision, "that the constitution does not confer suffrage on any one," then it inhered with the citizen before the constitution was framed. Our national life does not date from that instrument. The constitution is not the original declaration of rights. It was not framed until eleven years after our existence as a nation, nor fully ratified until nearly fourteen years after the inauguration of our national independence.

But however the letter and spirit of the constitution may be interpreted by the people, the judiciary of the nation has uniformly proved itself the echo of the party in power. When the slave power was dominant the Supreme Court decided that a black man was not a citizen, because he had not the right to vote; and when the constitution was so amended as to make all persons citizens, the same high tribunal decided that a woman, though a citizen, had not the right to vote. An African, by virtue of his United States citizenship, is declared, under recent amendments, a voter in every State of the Union; but when a woman, by virtue of her United States citizenship, applies to the Supreme Court for protection in the exercise of this same right, she is remanded to the State, by the unanimous decision of the nine judges on the bench, that "the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one." Such vacillating interpretations of constitutional law must unsettle our faith in judicial authority, and undermine the liberties of the whole people. Seeing by these decisions of the courts that the theory of our government, the Declaration of Independence, and recent constitutional amendments, have no significance for woman, that all the grand principles of equality are glittering generalities for her, we must fall back once more to our former demand of a sixteenth amendment to the federal constitution, that, in clear, unmistakable language, shall declare the status of woman in this republic.

Digitized by Google

The Declaration of Independence struck a blow at every existent form of government by making the individual the source of all power. This is the sun, and the one central truth around which all genuine republics must keep their course or perish. National supremacy means something more than power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce. It means national protection and security in the exercise of the right of self-government, which comes alone by and through the use of the ballot. Women are the only class of citizens still wholly unrepresented in the government, and yet we possess every requisite qualification for voters in the United States. Women possess property and education; we take out naturalization-papers and passports and register ships. We preëmpt lands, pay taxes (women sometimes work out the road-tax with their own hands) and suffer for our own violation of laws. We are neither idiots, lunatics, nor criminals, and according to our State constitution lack but one qualification for voters, namely, sex, which is an insurmountable qualification, and therefore equivalent to a bill of attainder against one-half the people, a power neither the States nor the United States can legally exercise, being forbidden in article 1, sections 9, 10, of the constitution. Our rulers have the right to regulate the suffrage, but they cannot abolish it for any class of citizens, as has been done in the case of the women of this republic, without a direct violation of the fundamental law of the land. All concessions of privileges or redress of grievances are mockery for any class that have no voice in the laws, and law-makers; hence we demand the ballot, that scepter of power in our own hands, as the only sure protection for our rights of person and property under all conditions. If the few may grant and withhold rights at their pleasure, the many cannot be said to enjoy the blessings of self-government.

William H. Seward said in his great speech on "Freedom and Union," in the United States Senate, February 29, 1860:

> Mankind have a natural right, a natural instinct, and a natural capacity for self-government; and when, as here, they are sufficiently ripened by culture, they will and must have self-government, and no other.

Jefferson said:

> The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time; the hand of freedom may destroy, but cannot disjoin them.

Few people comprehend the length and breadth of the principle we are advocating to-day, and how closely it is allied to everything vital in our system of government. Our personal grievances, such as being robbed of property and children by unjust husbands; denied admission into the colleges, the trades and professions; compelled to work at starving prices, by no means round out this whole question. In asking for a sixteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, and the protection of congress against the injustice of State law, we are fighting the same battle as Jefferson and Hamilton fought in 1776, as Calhoun and Clay in 1828, as Abraham Lincoln and Jefferson Davis in 1860, namely, the limit of State rights and federal power. The enfranchisement of woman involves the same vital principle of our government that is dividing and distracting the two great political parties at this hour.

Digitized by Google

There is nothing a foreigner coming here finds it so difficult to understand as the wheel within a wheel in our national and State governments, and the possibility of carrying them on without friction; and this is the difficulty and danger we are fast finding out. The recent amendments are steps in the right direction toward national unity, securing equal rights to all citizens, in every latitude and longitude. But our congressional debates, judicial decisions, and the utterances of campaign orators, continually falling back to the old ground, are bundles of contradictions on this vital question. Inasmuch as we are, first, citizens of the United States, and second, of the State wherein we reside, the primal rights of all citizens should be regulated by the national government, and complete equality in civil and political rights everywhere secured. When women are denied the right to enter institutions of learning, and practice in the professions, unjust discriminations made against sex even more degrading and humiliating than were ever made against color, surely woman, too, should be protected by a civil-rights bill and a sixteenth amendment that should make her political status equal with all other citizens of the republic.

The right of suffrage, like the currency of the post-office department, demands national regulation. We can all remember the losses sustained by citizens in traveling from one State to another under the old system of State banks. We can imagine the confusion if each State regulated its post-offices, and the transit of the mails across its borders. The benefits we find in uniformity and unity in these great interests would pervade all others where equal conditions were secured. Some citizens are asking for a national bankrupt law, that a person released from his debts in one State may be free in every other. Some are for a religious freedom amendment that shall forever separate church and State; forbidding a religious test as a condition of suffrage or a qualification for office; forbidding the reading of the Bible in the schools and the exempting of church property and sectarian institutions of learning or charity from taxation. Some are demanding a national marriage law, that a man legally married in one State may not be a bigamist in another. Some are asking a national prohibitory law, that a reformed drunkard who is shielded from temptation in one State may not be environed with dangers in another. And thus many individual interests point to a growing feeling among the people in favor of homogeneous legislation. As several of the States are beginning to legislate on the woman suffrage question, it is of vital moment that there should be some national action.

As the laws now are, a woman who can vote, hold office, be tried by a jury of her own peers—yea, and sit on the bench as justice of the peace in the territory of Wyoming, may be reduced to a political pariah in the State of New York. A woman who can vote and hold office on the school board, and act as county superintendent in Kansas and Minnesota, is denied these rights in passing into Pennsylvania. A woman who can be a member of the school board in Maine, Wisconsin, Iowa, and California, loses all these privileges in New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware. When representatives from the territories are sent to congress by the

Digitized by Google

votes of women, it is time to have some national recognition of this class of citizens.

This demand of national protection for national citizens is fated to grow stronger every day. The government of the United States, as the constitution is now interpreted, is powerless to give a just equivalent for the supreme allegiance it claims. One sound democratic principle fully recognized and carried to its logical results in our government, declaring all citizens equal before the law, would soon chase away the metaphysical mists and fogs that cloud our political views in so many directions. When congress is asked to put the name of God in the constitution, and thereby pledge the nation to some theological faith in which some United States citizens may not believe and thus subject a certain class to political ostracism and social persecution, it is asked not to protect but to oppress the citizens of the several States in their most sacred rights—to think, reason, and decide all questions of religion and conscience for themselves, without fear or favor from the government. Popular sentiment and church persecution is all that an advanced thinker in science and religion should be called on to combat. The State should rather throw its shield of protection around those uttering liberal, progressive ideas; for the nation has the same interest in every new thought as it has in the invention of new machinery to lighten labor, in the discovery of wells of oil, or mines of coal, copper, iron, silver or gold. As in the laboratory of nature new forms of beauty are forever revealing themselves, so in the world of thought a higher outlook gives a clearer vision of the heights man in freedom shall yet attain. The day is past for persecuting the philosophers of the physical sciences. But what a holocaust of martyrs bigotry is still making of those bearing the richest treasures of thought, in religion and social ethics, in their efforts to roll off the mountains of superstition that have so long darkened the human mind!

The numerous demands by the people for national protection in many rights not specified in the constitution, prove that the people have outgrown the compact that satisfied the fathers, and the more it is expounded and understood the more clearly its monarchical features can be traced to its English origin. And it is not at all surprising that, with no chart or compass for a republic, our fathers, with all their educational prejudices in favor of the mother country, with her literature and systems of jurisprudence, should have also adopted her ideas of government, and in drawing up their national compact engrafted the new republic on the old constitutional monarchy, a union whose incompatibility has involved their sons in continued discussion as to the true meaning of the instrument. A recent writer says:

> The Constitution of the United States is the result of a fourfold compromise: *First*—Of unity with individual interests; of national sovereignty with the so-called sovereignty of States; *Second*—Of the republic with monarchy; *Third*—Of freedom with slavery; *Fourth*—Of democracy with aristocracy.

It is founded, therefore, on the fourfold combination of principles perfectly incompatible and eternally excluding each other; founded for the purpose of equally preserving these principles in spite of their incompati-

Digitized by Google

bility, and of carrying out their practical results—in other words, for the purpose of making an impossible thing possible. And a century of discussion has not yet made the constitution understood. It has no settled interpretation. Being a series of compromises, it can be expounded in favor of many directly opposite principles,

A distinguished American statesman remarked that the war of the rebellion was waged "to expound the constitution." It is a pertinent question now, shall all other contradictory principles be retained in the constitution until they, too, are expounded by civil war? On what theory is it less dangerous to defraud twenty million women of their inalienable rights than four million negroes? Is not the same principle involved in both cases? We ask congress to pass a sixteenth amendment, not only for woman's protection, but for the safety of the nation. Our people are filled with unrest to-day because there is no fair understanding of the basis of individual rights, nor the legitimate power of the national government. The Republican party took the ground during the war that congress had the right to establish a national currency in every State; that it had the right to emancipate and enfranchise the slaves; to change their political status in one-half the States of the union; to pass a civil rights bill, securing to the freedman a place in the schools, colleges, trades, professions, hotels, and all public conveyances for travel. And they maintained their right to do all these as the best measures for peace, though compelled by war.

And now, when congress is asked to extend the same protection to the women of the nation, we are told they have not the power, and we are remanded to the States. They say the emancipation of the slave was a war measure, a military necessity; that his enfranchisement was a political necessity. We might with propriety ask if the present condition of the nation, with its political outlook, its election frauds daily reported, the corrupt action of men in official position, governors, judges, and boards of canvassers, has not brought us to a moral necessity where some new element is needed in government. But, alas! when women appeal to congress for the protection of their natural rights of person and property, they send us for redress to the courts, and the courts remand us to the States. You did not trust the Southern freedman to the arbitrary will of courts and States! Why send your mothers, wives and daughters to the unwashed, unlettered, unthinking masses that carry popular elections?

We are told by one class of philosophers that the growing tendency to increase national power and authority is leading to a dangerous centralization; that the safety of the republic rests in local self-government. Says the editor of the Boston *Index:*

What is local self-government? Briefly, that without any interference from without, every citizen should manage his own personal affairs in his own way, according to his own pleasure; that every town should manage its own town affairs in the same manner and under the same restriction; every county its own county affairs, every State its own State affairs. But the independent exercise of this autonomy, by personal and corporate individuals, has one fundamental condition, viz.: the maintenance of all these individualites intact, each in its own sphere of action, with its rights uninfringed and its freedom uncurtailed in that sphere, yet each also preserving its just relation to all the

Digitized by Google

rest in an all comprehensive social organization. Every citizen would thus stand, as it were, in the center of several concentric and enlarging circles of relationship to his kind; he would have duties and rights in each relation, not only as an individual but also as a member of town, county, State and national organization. His local self-government will be at his highest possible point of realization, when in each of these relations his individual duties are discharged and his rights maintained.

On the other hand, what is centralization?

It is such a disorganization of this well-balanced, harmonious and natural system as shall result in the absorption of all substantial power by a central authority, to the destruction of the autonomy of the various individualities above mentioned; such as was produced, for instance, when the *municipia* of the Roman empire lost their corporate independence and melted into the vast imperial despotism which prepared the way for the collapse of society under the blows of Northern barbarism. Such a centralization must inevitably be produced by decay of that stubborn stickling for rights, out of which local self-government has always grown. That is, if individual rights in the citizen, the town, the county, the State, shall not be vindicated as beyond all price, and defended with the utmost jealousy, at whatever cost, the spirit of liberty must have already died out, and the dreary process of centralization be already far advanced. It will thus be evident that the preservation of individual rights is the only possible preventative of centralization, and that free society has no interest to be compared for an instant in importance with that of preserving these individual rights. No nation is free in which this is not the paramount concern. Woe to America when her sons and her daughters begin to sneer at rights! Just so long as the citizens are protected individually in their rights, the towns and counties and States cannot be stripped; but if the former lose all love for their own liberties as equal units of society, the latter will become the empty shells of creatures long perished. The nation as such, therefore, if it would be itself free and non-centralized, must find its own supreme interest in the protection of its individual citizens in the fullest possible enjoyment of their equal rights and liberties.

As this question of woman's enfranchisement is one of national safety, we ask you to remember that we are citizens of the United States, and, as such, claim the protection of the national flag in the exercise of our national rights, in every latitude and longitude, on sea, land, at home as well as abroad; against the tyranny of States, as well as against foreign aggressions. Local authorities may regulate the exercise of these rights; they may settle all minor questions of property, but the inalienable personal rights of citizenship should be declared by the constitution, interpreted by the Supreme Court, protected by congress and enforced by the arm of the executive. It is nonsense to talk of State rights until the graver question of personal liberties is first understood and adjusted. President Hayes, in reply to an address of welcome at Charlottesville, Va., September 25, 1877, said:

Equality under the laws for all citizens is the corner-stone of the structure of the restored harmony from which the ancient friendship is to rise. In this pathway I am going, the pathway where your illustrious men led—your Jefferson, your Madison, your Monroe, your Washington.

If, in this statement, President Hayes is thoroughly sincere, then he will not hesitate to approve emphatically the principle of national protection for national citizens. He will see that the protection of all the national citizens in all their rights, civil, political, and religious—not by the muskets of United States troops, but by the peaceable authority of United

States courts—is not a principle that applies to a single section of the country, but to all sections alike; he will see that the incorporation of such a principle in the constitution cannot be regarded as a measure of force imposed upon the vanquished, since it would be law alike to the vanquished and the victor. In short, he will see that there is no other sufficient guarantee of that equality of all citizens, which he well declares to be the "corner-stone of the structure of restored harmony." The Boston *Journal* of July 19, said:

There are cases where it seems as if the constitution should empower the federal government to step in and protect the citizen in the State, when the local authorities are in league with the assassins; but, as it now reads, no such provision exists.

That the constitution does not make such provision is not the fault of the president; it must be attributed to the leading Republicans who had it in their power once to change the constitution so as to give the most ample powers to the general government. When Attorney-General Devens was charged last May with negligence in not prosecuting the parties accused of the Mountain Meadow massacre, his defense was, that this horrible crime was not against the United States, but against the territory of Utah. Yet, it was a great company of industrious, honest, unoffending United States citizens who were foully and brutally murdered in cold blood. When Chief-Justice Waite gave his charge to the jury in the Ellentown conspiracy cases, at Charleston, S. C., June 1, 1877, he said:

That a number of citizens of the United States have been killed, there can be no question; but that is not enough to enable the government of the United States to interfere for their protection. Under the constitution that duty belongs to the State alone. But when an unlawful combination is made to interfere with any of the rights of natural citizenship secured to citizens of the United States by the national constitution, then an offense is committed against the laws of the United States, and it is not only the right but the absolute duty of the national government to interfere and afford the citizens that protection which every good government is bound to give.

General Hawley, in an address before a college last spring, said:

Why, it is asked, does our government permit outrages in a State which it would exert all its authority to redress, even at the risk of war, if they were perpetrated under a foreign government? Are the rights of American citizens more sacred on the soil of Great Britain or France than on the soil of one of our own States? Not at all. But the government of the United States is clothed with power to act with imperial sovereignty in the one case, while in the other its authority is limited to the degree of utter impotency, in certain circumstances. The State sovereignty excludes the Federal over most matters of dealing between man and man, and if the State laws are properly enforced there is not likely to be any ground of complaint, but if they are not, the federal government, if not specially called on according to the terms of the constitution, is helpless. Citizen A. B., grievously wronged, beaten, robbed, lynched within a hair's breadth of death, may apply in vain to any and all prosecuting officers of the State. The forms of law that might give him redress are all there; the prosecuting officers, judges, and sheriffs, that might act, are there; but, under an oppressive and tyranical public sentiment, they refuse to move. In such an exigency the government of the United States can do no more than the government of any neighboring State; that is, unless the State concerned calls for aid, or unless the offense rises to the dignity of insurrection or rebellion. The reason is, that the framers of our govermental system left to the several States the sole guardianship of the personal and relative private rights of the people.

Digitized by Google

Such is the imperfect development of our own nationality in this respect that we have really no right as yet to call ourselves a nation in the true sense of the word, nor shall we have while this state of things continues. Thousands have begun to feel this keenly, of which a few illustrations may suffice. A communication to the New York *Tribune*, June 9, signed "Merchant," said:

> Before getting into a quarrel and perhaps war with Mexico about the treatment of our flag and citizens, would it not be as well, think you, for the government to try and make the flag a protection to the citizens on our own soil?

That is what it has never been since the foundation of our government in a large portion of our common country. The kind of government the people of this country expect and intend to have—State rights or no State rights, no matter how much blood and treasure it may cost—is a government to protect the humblest citizen in the exercise of all his rights.

When the rebellion of the South against the government began, one of the most noted secessionists of Baltimore asked one of the regular army officers what the government expected to gain by making war on the South. "Well," the officer replied, laying his hand on the cannon by which he was standing, "we intend to use these until it is as safe for a Northern man to express his political opinions in the South, as it is for a Southern man to express his in the North." Senator Blaine, at a banquet in Trenton, N. J., July 2, declared that a "government which did not offer protection to every citizen in every State had no right to demand allegiance." Ex-Senator Wade, of Ohio, in a letter to the Washington *National Republican* of July 16, said of the president's policy:

> I greatly fear this policy, under cover of what is called local self-government, is but an ignominious surrender of the principles of nationality for which our armies fought and for which thousands upon thousands of our brave men died, and without which the war was a failure and our boasted government a myth.

Behind the slavery of the colored race was the principle of State rights. Their emancipation and enfranchisement were important, not only as a vindication of our great republican idea of individual rights, but as the first blow in favor of national unity—of a consistent, homogeneous government. As all our difficulties, State and national, are finally referred to the constitution, it is of vital importance that that instrument should not be susceptible of a different interpretation from every possible standpoint. It is folly to spend another century in expounding the equivocal language of the constitution. If under that instrument, supposed to be the *Magna Charta* of American liberties, all United States citizens do not stand equal before the law, it should without further delay be so amended as in plain, unmistakable language to declare what are the rights, privileges, and immunities that belong to citizens of a republic.

There is no reason why the people of to-day should be governed by the laws and constitutions of men long since dead and buried. Surely those who understand the vital issues of this hour are better able to legislate for the living present than those who governed a hundred years ago. If the nineteenth century is to be governed by the opinions of the eighteenth,

Digitized by Google

and the twentieth by the nineteenth, the world will always be governed by dead men. . . . . .

The cry of centralization could have little significance if the constitution were so amended as to protect all United States citizens in their inalienable rights. That national supremacy that holds individual freedom and equality more sacred than State rights and secures representation to all classes of people, is a very different form of centralization from that in which all the forces of society are centered in a single arm. But the recognition of the principle of national supremacy, as declared in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, has been practically nullified and the results of the war surrendered, by remanding woman to the States for the protection of her civil and political rights. The Supreme Court decisions and the congressional reports on this point are in direct conflict with the idea of national unity, and the principle of States rights involved in this discussion must in time remand all United States citizens alike to State authority for the protection of those rights declared to inhere in the people at the foundation of the government.

You may listen to our demands, gentlemen, with dull ears, and smile incredulously at the idea of danger to our institutions from continued violation of the civil and political rights of women, but the question of what citizens shall enjoy the rights of suffrage involves our national existence; for, if the constitutional rights of the humblest citizen may be invaded with impunity, laws interpreted on the side of injustice, judicial decisions based not on reason, sound argument, nor the spirit and letter of our declarations and theories of government, but on the customs of society and what dead men are supposed to have thought, not what they said—what will the rights of the ruling powers even be in the future with a people educated into such modes of thought and action? The treatment of every individual in a community—in our courts, prisons, asylums, of every class of petitioners before congress—strengthens or undermines the foundations of that temple of liberty whose corner-stones were laid one century ago with bleeding hands and anxious hearts, with the hardships, privations, and sacrifices of a seven years' war. He who is able from the conflicts of the present to forecast the future events, cannot but contemplate with anxiety the fate of this republic, unless our constitution be at once subjected to a thorough emendation, making it more comprehensively democratic.

A review of the history of our nation during the century will show the American people that all the obstacles that have impeded their political, moral and material progress from the dominion of slavery down to the present epidemic of political corruptions, are directly and indirectly traceable to the federal constitution as their source and support. Hence the necessity of prompt and appropriate amendments. Nothing that is incorrect in principle can ever be productive of beneficial results, and no custom or authority is able to alter or overrule this inviolate law of development. The catch-phrases of politicians, such as "organic development," "the logic of events," and "things will regulate themselves," have deceived the thoughtless long enough. There is just one road to safety,

Digitized by Google

and that is to understand the law governing the situation and to bring the nation in line with it. Grave political problems are solved in two ways—by a wise forethought, and reformation; or by general dissatisfaction, resistance, and revolution.

In closing, let me remind you, gentlemen, that woman has not been a heedless spectator of all the great events of the century, nor a dull listener to the grand debates on human freedom and equality. She has learned the lesson of self-sacrifice, self-discipline, and self-government in the same school with the heroes of American liberty.*

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, of New York, corresponding secretary of the association, said: *Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee*—You have heard the general argument for woman from Mrs. Stanton, but there are women here from all parts of the Union, and each one feels that she must say a word to show how united we stand. It is because we have respect for law that we come before you to-day. We recognize the fact that in good law lies the security of all our rights, but as woman has been denied the constructive rights of the declaration and constitution, she is obliged to ask for a direct recognition in the adoption of a sixteenth amendment.

The first principle of liberty is division of power. In the country of the czar or the sultan there is no liberty of thought or action. In limited monarchies power is somewhat divided, and we find larger liberty and a broader civilization. Coming to the United States we find a still greater division of power, a still more extended liberty—civil, religious, political. No nation in the world is as respected as our own; no title so proud as that of American citizen; it carries with it abroad a protection as large as did that of Rome two thousand years ago. But as proud as is this name of American citizen, it brings with it only shame and humiliation to one-half of the nation. Woman has no part nor lot in the matter. The pride of citizenship is not for her, for woman is still a political slave. While the form of our government seems to include the whole people, one-half of them are denied a right to participate in its benefits, are denied the right of self-government. Woman equally with man has natural rights; woman equally with man is a responsible being.

It is said women are not fit for freedom. Well, then, secure us freedom and make us fit for it. Macaulay said many politicians of his time were in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition that no people were fit to be free till they were in a condition to use their freedom;

* In the whole course of our struggle for equal rights I never felt more exasperated than on this occasion, standing before a committee of men many years my juniors, all comfortably seated in arm-chairs, I pleading for rights they all enjoyed though in no respect my superiors, denied me on the shallow grounds of sex. But this humiliation I had often felt before. The peculiarly aggravating feature of the present occasion was the studied inattention and contempt of the chairman, Senator Wadleigh of New Hampshire. Having prepared my argument with care, I naturally desired the attention of every member of the committee, all of which, with the exception of Senator Wadleigh, I seemingly had. He however took special pains to show that he did not intend to listen. He alternately looked over some manuscripts and newspapers before him, then jumped up to open or close a door or window. He stretched, yawned, gazed at the ceiling, cut his nails, sharpened his pencil, changing his occupation and position every two minutes, effectually preventing the establishment of the faintest magnetic current between the speakers and the committee. It was with difficulty I restrained the impulse more than once to hurl my manuscript at his head.—[E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

"but," said Macaulay, "this maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story, who resolved not to go into the water till he had learned to swim. If men [or women] are to wait for liberty till they become good and wise in slavery, they may indeed wait forever."

There has been much talk about precedent. Many women in this country vote upon school questions, and in England at all municipal elections. I wish to call your attention a little further back, to the time that the Saxons first established free government in England. Women, as well as men, took part in the Witenagemote, the great national council of our Saxon ancestors in England. When Whightred, king of Kent, in the seventh century, assembled the national legislature at Baghamstead to enact a new code of laws, the queen, abbesses, and many ladies of quality signed the decrees. Also, at Beaconsfield, the abbesses took part in the council. In the reign of Henry III. four women took seats in parliament, and in the reign of Edward I. ten ladies were called to parliament and helped to govern Great Britain. Also, in 1252, Henry left his Queen Elinor as keeper of the great seal, or lord chancellor, while he went abroad. She sat in the Aula Regia, the highest court of the kingdom, holding the highest judicial power in great Britain. Not only among our forefathers in Britain do we find that women took part in government, but, going back to the Roman Empire, we find the Emperor Heliogabalus introducing his mother into the senate, and giving her a seat near the consuls. He also established a senate of women, which met on the Collis Quirinalis. When Aurelian was emperor he favored the representation of women, and determined to revive this senate, which in lapse of time had fallen to decay. Plutarch mentions that women sat and deliberated in councils, and on questions of peace and war. Hence we have precedents extending very far back into history.

It is sometimes said that women do not desire freedom. But I tell you the desire for freedom lives in every heart. It may be hidden as the water of the never-freezing, rapid-flowing river Neva is hidden. In the winter the ice from Lake Lagoda floats down till it is met by the ice setting up from the sea, when they unite and form a compact mass over it. Men stand upon it, sledges run over it, splendid palaces are built upon it; but beneath all the Neva still rapidly flows, itself unfrozen. The presence of these women before you shows their desire for freedom. They have come from the North, from the South, from the East, from the West, and from the far Pacific slope, demanding freedom for themselves and for all women.

Our demands are often met by the most intolerable tyranny. The Albany *Law Journal*, one of the most influential legal journals of the great State of New York, had the assurance a few years ago to tell Miss Anthony and myself if we were not suited with "our laws" we could leave the country. What laws did they mean? Men's laws. If we were not suited with these men's laws, made by them to protect themselves, we could leave the country. We were advised to expatriate ourselves, to banish ourselves. But we shall not do it, It is our country, and we shall stay here and change the laws. We shall secure their amendment, so that under them there shall be exact and permanent political equality

Digitized by Google

between men and women. Change is not only a law of life; it is an essential proof of the existence of life. This country has attained its greatness by ever enlarging the bounds of freedom.

In our hearts we feel that there is a word sweeter than mother, home, or heaven. That word is LIBERTY. We ask it of you now. We say to you, secure to us this liberty—the same liberty you have yourselves. In doing this you will not render yourselves poor, but will make us rich indeed.

Mrs. STEWART of Delaware, in illustrating the folly of adverse arguments based on woman's ignorance of political affairs, gave an amusing account of her colored man servant the first time he voted. He had been full of bright anticipations of the coming election day, and when it dawned at last, he asked if he could be spared from his work an hour or so, to vote. "Certainly, Jo," said she, "by all means; go to the polls and do your duty as a citizen." Elated with his new-found dignity, Jo ran down the road, and with a light heart and shining face deposited his vote. On his return Mrs. Stewart questioned him as to his success at the polls. "Well," said he, "first one man nabbed me and gave me the tickets he said I ought to vote, and then another man did the same. I said yes to both and put the tickets in my pocket. I had no use for those Republican or Democratic bits of paper." "Well, Jo," said Mrs. Stewart, what did you do?" "Why I took that piece of paper that I paid $2.50 for and put it in the box. I knew that was worth something." "Alas! Jo," said his mistress, "you voted your tax receipt, so your first vote has counted nothing." Do you think, gentlemen, said Mrs. Stewart, that such women as attend our conventions, and speak from our platform, could make so ludicrous a blunder? I think not.

The Rev. OLYMPIA BROWN, a delegate from Connecticut, addressed the committee as follows: *Gentlemen of the Committee*—I would not intrude upon your time and exhaust your patience by any further hearing upon this subject if it were not that men are continually saying to us that we do not want the ballot; that it is only a handful of women that have ever asked for it; and I think by our coming up from these different States, from Delaware, from Oregon, from Missouri, from Connecticut, from New Hampshire, and giving our testimony, we shall convince you that it is not a few merely, but that it is a general demand from the women in all the different States of the Union; and if we come here with stammering tongues, causing you to laugh by the very absurdity of the manner in which we advocate our opinions, it will only convince you that it is not a few "gifted" women, but the rank and file of the women of our country unaccustomed to such proceedings as these, who come here to tell you that we all desire the right of suffrage. Nor shall our mistakes and inability to advocate our cause in an effective manner be an argument against us, because it is not the province of voters to conduct meetings in Washington. It is rather their province to stay at home and quietly read the proceeding of members of congress, and if they find these proceedings correct, to vote to return them another year. So that our very mistakes shall argue for us and not against us.

Digitized by Google

In the ages past the right of citizenship meant the right to enjoy or possess or attain all those civil and political rights that are enjoyed by any other citizen. But here we have a class who can bear the burdens and punishments of citizens, but cannot enjoy their privileges and rights. But even the meanest may petition, and so we come with our thousands of petitions, asking you to protect us against the unjust discriminations imposed by State laws. Nor do we find that there is any conflict between the duties of the national government and the functions of the State. The United States government has to do with general interests, but everything that is special, has to do with sectional interests, belongs to the State. Said Charles Sumner:

> The State exercises its proper functions when it makes local laws, promotes local charities, and by its local knowledge brings the guardianship of government to the homes of its citizens; but the State transcends its proper functions when in any manner it interferes with those equal rights recorded in the Declaration of Independence.

The State is local, the United States is universal. And, says Charles Sumner, "What can be more universal than the rights of man?" I would add, "What can be more universal than the rights of woman?" extending further than the rights of man, because woman is the heaven-appointed guardian of the home; because woman by her influence and in her office as an educator makes the character of man; because women are to be found wherever men are to be found, as their mothers bringing them into the world, watching them, teaching them, guiding them into manhood. Wherever there is a home, wherever there is a human interest, there is to be felt the interest of women, and so this cause is the most universal of any cause under the sun; and, therefore, it has a claim upon the general government. Therefore we come petitioning that you will protect us in our rights, by aiding us in the passage of the sixteenth amendment, which will make the constitution plain in our favor, or by such actions as will enable us to cast our ballots at the polls without being interfered with by State authorities. And we hope you will do this at no distant day. I hope you will not send my sister, the honorable lady from Delaware, to the boy, Jo, to ask him to define her position in the republic. I hope you will not bid any of these women at home to ask ignorant men whether they may be allowed to discharge their obligations as citizens in the matter of suffrage. I hope you will not put your wives and mothers in the power of men who have never given a half hour's consideration to the subject of government, and who are wholly unfit to exercise their judgment as to whether women should have the right of suffrage.

I will not insult your common sense by bringing up the old arguments as to whether we have the right to vote. I believe every man of you knows we have that right—that our right to vote is based upon the same authority as yours. I believe every man understands that, according to the declaration and the constitution, women should be allowed to exercise the right of suffrage, and therefore it is not necessary for me to do more than bear my testimony from the State of Connecticut, and tell you that the women from the rank and file, the law-abiding women, desire the

Digitized by Google

ballot; not only that they desire it, but they mean to have it. And to accomplish this result I need not remind you that they will work year in and year out, that they will besiege members of congress everywhere, and that they will come here year after year asking you to protect them in their rights and to see that justice is done in the republic. Therefore, for your own peace, we hope you will not keep us waiting a long time. The fact that some States have made, temporarily, some good laws, does not weaken our demand upon you for the protection which the ballot gives to every citizen. Our interests are still uncared for, and we do not wish to be thus sent from pillar to post to get our rights. We wish to take our stand as citizens of the United States, as we have been declared to be by the Supreme Court, and we wish to be protected in the rights of citizenship. We hope the day is at hand when our prayers will be heard by you. Let us have at an early day in the *Congressional Record*, a report of the proceedings of this committee, and the action of the Senate in favor of woman's right to vote.

Brief remarks were also made by Mrs. Lawrence of Massachusetts, Mary A. Thompson, M. D., of Oregon, Mary Powers Filley of New Hampshire, Mrs. Blake of New York, Mrs. Hooker of Connecticut, and Sara Andrews Spencer of Washington.

At the close of these two day's hearings before the Committee on Privileges and Elections,* Senator Hoar of Massachusetts, offered, and the committee adopted the following complimentary resolution:

Resolved, That the arguments upon the very important questions discussed before the committee have been presented with propriety, dignity and ability, and that the committee will consider the same on Tuesday next, at 10 A. M.

The Washington *Evening Star* of January 11, 1876, said:

The woman suffrage question will be a great political issue some day. A movement in the direction of alleged rights by a body of American citizens cannot be forever checked, even though its progress may for many years be very gradual. Now that the advocates of suffrage for woman have become convinced that the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments are not sufficiently explicit to make woman's right to vote unquestioned, and that a sixteenth amendment is necessary to effect the practical exercise of the right, the millennial period that they look for is to all intents and purposes indefinitely postponed, for constitutional amendments are not passed in a day. But there are so many sound arguments to be advanced in favor of woman suffrage that it cannot fail in time to be weighed as a matter of policy, after it shall have been over-

* The first hearing was held in the committee room, but that not being large enough to accommodate the crowds that wished to hear the arguments, the use of the Senate reception room was granted for the second, which although very much larger, was packed, with the corridors leading to it, long before the committee took their places.

Digitized by Google

whelmingly conceded as a matter of right. And it is noticeable that the arguments of the opponents are coming more and more to be based on expediency, and hardly attempt to answer the claim that as American citizens women are entitled to the right. If the whole body of American women desired the practical exercise of this right, it is hard to see what valid opposition to their claims could be made. All this however does not amend the constitution. Woman suffrage must become a matter of policy for a political party before it can be realized. Congress does not pass revolutionary measures on abstract considerations of right. This question is of a nature to become a living political issue after it has been sufficiently ridiculed.

On Saturday evening, January 12, a reception was given to the delegates to the convention by Hon. Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, at the National Hotel. The suite of rooms so long occupied by this liberal representative of the South, was thus opened to unwonted guests—women asking for the same rights gained at the point of the sword by his former slaves! Seated in his wheel-chair, from which he had so often been carried by a faithful attendant to his place in the House of Representatives, he cordially welcomed the ladies as they gathered about him, assuring them of his interest in this question and promising his aid.

For the first time Miss Julia Smith of anti-tax fame, of Glastonbury, Connecticut, was present at a Washington convention. She was the recipient of much social attention. A reception was tendered her by Mrs. Spofford of the Riggs House, giving people an opportunity to meet this heroic woman of eighty-three, who, with her younger sister Abby, had year after year suffered the sale of their fine Jersey cows and beautiful meadow lands, rather than pay taxes while unrepresented. Many women, notable in art, science and literature, and men high in political station were present on this occasion. All crowded about Miss Smith, as, supported by Mrs. Hooker, in response to a call for a speech, particularly in regard to the Gladstonbury cows, as famous as herself, she said:

There are but two of our cows left at present, Taxey and Votey. It is something a little peculiar that Taxey is very obtrusive; why, I can scarcely step out of doors without being confronted by her, while Votey is quiet and shy, but she is growing more docile and domesticated every day, and it is my opinion that in a very short time, wherever you find Taxey there Votey will be also.

At the close of Miss Smith's remarks, Abby Hutchinson Patton sang "Auld Lang Syne" in a very effective manner; one or two readings followed, a few modern ballads were sung, and thus

Digitized by Google

closed the first of the many delightful receptions given by Mr. and Mrs. Spofford to the officers and members of the National Association.

Mrs. Hooker spent several weeks at the Riggs House, holding frequent woman suffrage conversazioni in its elegant parlors; also speaking upon the question at receptions given in her honor by the wives of members of congress, or residents of Washington.*

During the week of the convention, public attention was called to a scarcely known Anti-Woman Suffrage Society, formed in 1871, of which Mrs. General Sherman, Mrs. Admiral Dahlgren and Mrs. Almira Lincoln Phelps were officers, by the publication of an undelivered letter from Mrs. Phelps to Mrs. Hooker:

To the Editor of the Post:

The following was written nearly seven years since, but was never sent to Mrs. Hooker. The letter chanced to appear among old papers, and as there is a meeting of women suffragists, with Mrs. Hooker present, and, moreover, as they have mentioned the names of Mrs. Dahlgren and Mrs. General Sherman, opposers, I am willing to bear my share of the opposition, as I acted as corresponding secretary to the Anti-Suffrage Society, which was formed under the auspices of these ladies.

MRS. DAHLGREN.

---

* Mr. and Mrs. Holt, of 1,339 L street, entertained their friends and a numerous company of distinguished guests on Friday evening, in honor of Mrs. Beecher Hooker. She delivered one of her ablest speeches on the woman suffrage question. She was listened to with breathless silence by eminent men and women, who confessed, at the termination of her speech, that they were "almost persuaded" to join her ranks—the highest tribute to her eloquent defense of her position. Mrs. Hooker's intellect is not her only charm. Her beautiful face and attractive manners all help to make converts. Mrs. Julia N. Holmes, the poet, one of the most admired ladies present, and Mrs. Southworth, the novelist, wore black velvet and diamonds. Mrs. Hodson Burnett, that "Lass o' Lowrie," in colored and rose silk with princess scarf, looked charmingly. Mrs. Senator Sargent, Mrs. Charles Nordhoff and her friends, the elegant Miss Thurman, of Cincinnati, and Miss Joseph, a brilliant brunette with scarlet roses and jet ornaments, of Washington, were much observed. Mrs. Dr. Wallace, of the *New York Herald*, wore cuir colored gros-grain with guipure lace trimmings, flowers and diamonds. Miss Coyle was richly attired. Mrs. Ingersoll, wife of the exceptional orator, was the center of observation with Mrs. Hooker; she wore black velvet, roses, and diamonds—has a noble presence and Grecian face. General Forney, of Alabama, Hon. John F. Wait, M. C., Captain Dutton and Colonel Mallory, of U. S. Army, Judge Tabor (Fourth Auditor), Dr. Cowes, Col. Ingersol, Mrs. Hofman, of New York, a prominent lady of the Woman's Congress, lately assembled in this city, wore a distinguished toilette. Mrs. Spofford, of the Riggs House, was among the most noticeable ladies present, elegant and delightful in style and manner. Dr. Josephs and Col. G. W. Rice, of Boston, were of the most conspicious gentlemen present, who retired much edified with the entertainment of the evening.

H. LOUISE GATES.

Society was divided Saturday evening between the literary club which met at Willard's under the auspices of Mrs. Morrell, and the reception given at the residence of Senator Rollins, on Capitol Hill, to Mrs. Beecher Hooker, who spoke on the question of woman suffrage. It was said of Theodore Parker, if all his hearers stood on the same lofty plane that he did, his theology would be all right for them, and so in this matter of woman's rights. If all the advocates were as cultivated, refined, and convincing as Mrs. Hooker, one might almost be tempted to surrender. She certainly possesses that rare magnetic influence which seems to say, "Lend me your ears and I shall take your heart." Among her listeners we noticed Mrs. Joseph Ames, Grace Greenwood, Senator and Mrs. Rollins, Senator and Mrs. Wadleigh, Miss Rollins, Mrs. Solomon Bundy, Mrs. J. M. Holmes, Mrs. Brainerd, Mr. and Mrs. Doolittle, Dr. Patton and son, Prof. Thomas Taylor, Miss Robena Taylor, Mrs. Spofford, of the Riggs House, Prof. G. B. Stebbins, Mrs. Captain Platt, and Mr. and Mrs. Holt.—[Washington *Post*.

745664 A

Digitized by Google

EUTAW PLACE, BALTIMORE, January, 30, 1871.

To Mrs. Beecher Hooker:

DEAR MADAM—Hoping you will receive kindly what I am about to write, I will proceed without apologies. I have confidence in your nobleness of soul, and that you know enough of me to believe in my devotion to the best interests of woman. I can scarcely realize that you are giving your name and influence to a cause, which, with some good but, as I think, misguided women, numbers among its advocates others with loose morals. * * * We are, my dear madam, as I suppose, related through our common ancester Thomas Hooker. * * * Your husband, I believe, stands in the same relation to that good and noble man. Perhaps he may think with you on this woman suffrage question, but it does seem to me that a wife honoring her husband would not wish to join in such a crusade as is now going on to put woman on an equality with the rabble at the "hustings." If we could with propriety petition the Almighty to change the condition of the sexes and let men take a turn in bearing children and in suffering the physical ailments peculiar to women, which render them unfit for certain positions and business, why, in this case, if we really wish to be men, and thought God would change the established order, we might make our petition; but why ask congress to make us men? Circumstances drew me from the quiet of domestic life while I was yet young; but success in labors which involved publicity, and which may have been of advantage to society, was never considered as an equivalent to my own heart for the loss of such retirement. In the name of my sainted sister, Emma Willard, and of my friend Lydia Sigourney, and I think I might say in the name of the women of the past generation, who have been prominent as writers and educators (the exception may be made of Mary Wollstonecraft, Frances Wright, and a few licentious French writers) in our own country and in Europe, let me urge the high-souled and honorable of our sex to turn their energies into that channel which will enable them to act for the true interests of their sex. Yours respectfully,

ALMIRA LINCOLN PHELPS.

To which Mrs. Hooker, through *The Post*, replied:

WASHINGTON, January 15, 1878.

MRS. DAHLGREN—*Dear Madam:* Permit me to thank you for the opportunity to exonerate myself and the women of the suffrage movement all over the United States from the charge of favoring immorality in any form. I did not know before that Mrs. Phelps, whom I have always held in highest esteem as an educator and as one of the most advanced thinkers of her day, had so misconceived the drift of our movement; and you will pardon me, dear madam, for saying that it is hardly possible that Mrs. Sherman and yourself, in your opposition to it, can have been influenced by any apprehension that the women suffragists of the United States would, if entrusted with legislative power, proceed to use it for the desecration of their own sex, and the pollution of the souls of their husbands, brothers and sons. But having been publicly accused through your instrumentality of sympathy with the licentious practices of men, I shall take the liberty to send you a dozen copies of a little book entitled, "Womanhood; its Sanctities and Fidelities," which I published in 1874 for the specific purpose of bringing to the notice of American women the wonderful work being done across the water in the suppression of "State Patronage of Vice." * * * It is with a deep sense of gratitude to God that I am able to say that, according to my knowledge and belief, every woman in our movement, whether officer or private, is in sympathy with the spirit of this little book. I know of no inharmony

Digitized by Google

here, however we may differ upon minor points of expediency as to the best methods of working for the political advancement of woman. And further, it is the deep conviction of us all that the chief stumbling-block in the way of our obtaining the use of the ballot, is the apprehension among men of low degree that they will surely be limited in their base and brutal and sensual indulgencies when women are armed with equal political power.

As to my husband, to whose ancestry Mrs. Phelps so kindly alludes, permit me to say that he is not only descended from Thomas Hooker, the beloved first pastor of the old Centre Church in Hartford, and founder of the State of Connecticut, but further back his lineage takes root in one of England's most honored names, Richard Hooker, surnamed "The Judicious"; and I have been accustomed to say that, however it may be as to learning and position, the characteristic of judiciousness has not departed from the American stock. I will only add that Mr. Hooker is treasurer of our State suffrage association, and has spoken on the platform with me as president, whenever his professional duties would permit, and that he is the author of a tract on "The Bible and Woman Suffrage." Our society has printed several thousand copies of this tract, and the London National Women's Suffrage Society has reprinted it with words of high commendation for distribution in Great Britain. * * * And now, dear madam, thanking you once more for this most unexpected and most grateful opportunity for correcting misapprehensions that others may have entertained as well as Mrs. Phelps in regard to the design and tendencies of our movement, may I not ask that you will kindly read and consider the papers I shall take the liberty to send you, and hand them to your coworkers at your convenience?

That we all, as women who love our country and our kind, may be led to honor each other in our personal relations, while we work each in her respective way for that higher order of manhood and womanhood that alone can exalt our nation to the ideal of the fathers and mothers of the early republic, and preserve us an honored place among the peoples of the earth, is the prayer of Yours sincerely,

ISABELLA BEECHER HOOKER.

Evidently left without even the name of Mrs. Sherman or the Anti-Suffrage Society to sustain her, Mrs. Dahlgren memorialized the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections against the submission of the sixteenth amendment:

To the Honorable Committee on Privileges and Elections:

GENTLEMEN—Allow me, in courtesy, as a petitioner, to present one or two considerations regarding a sixteenth amendment, by which it is proposed to confer the right of suffrage upon the women of the United States. I ask this favor also in the interests of the masses of silent women, whose silence does not give consent, but who, in most modest earnestness, deprecate having the political life forced upon them.

This grave question is not one of simple expediency or the reverse; it might properly be held, were this the case, as a legitimate subject for agi-

Digitized by Google

tation. Our reasons of dissent to this dangerous inroad upon all precedent, lie deeper and strike higher. They are based upon that which in all Christian nations must be recognized as the higher law, the fundamental law upon which Christian society in its very construction must rest; and that law, as defined by the Almighty, is immutable. Through it the women of this Christian land, as mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, have distinct duties to perform of the most complex order, yet of the very highest and most sacred nature.

If in addition to all these responsibilities, others, appertaining to the domain assigned to men, are allotted to us, we shall be made the victims of an oppression not intended by a kind and wise Providence, and from which the refining influences of Christian civilization have emancipated us. We have but to look at the condition of our Indian sister, upon whose bended back the heavy pack is laid by her lord and master; who treads in subjection the beaten pathway of equal rights, and compare her situation with our own, to thank the God of Christian nations who has placed us above that plane, where right is might, and might is tyranny. We cannot without prayer and protest see our cherished privileges endangered, and have granted us only in exchange the so-called equal rights. We need more, and we claim, through our physical weakness and your courtesy as Christian gentlemen, that protection which we need for the proper discharge of those sacred and inalienable functions and rights conferred upon us by God. To these the vote, which is not a natural right (otherwise why not confer it upon idiots, lunatics, and adult boys) would be adverse.

When women ask for a distinct political life, a separate vote, they forget or they willfully ignore the higher law, whose logic may be thus condensed: Marriage is a sacred unity. The family, through it, is the foundation of the State. Each family is represented by its head, just as the State ultimately finds the same unity, through a series of representations. Out of this come peace, concord, proper representation, and adjustment —union.

The new doctrine, which is illusive, may be thus defined: Marriage is a mere compact, and means diversity. Each family, therefore, must have a separate individual representation, out of which arises diversity or division, and discord is the corner-stone of the State.

Gentlemen, we cannot displace the corner-stone without destruction to the edifice itself! The subject is so vast, has so many side issues, that a volume might as readily be laid before your honorable committee as these few words hastily written with an aching woman's heart. Personally, if any woman in this vast land has a grievance by not having a vote, I may claim that grievance to be mine. With father, brother, husband, son, taken away by death, I stand utterly alone, with minor children to educate and considerable property interests to guard. But I would deem it unpatriotic to ask for a general law which must prove disastrous to my country, in order to meet that exceptional position in which, by the adorable will of God, I am placed. I prefer, indeed, to trust to that moral influence over men which intelligence never fails to exercise, and which is

Digitized by Google

really more potent in the management of business affairs than the direct vote. In this I am doubtless as old-fashioned as were our grandmothers, who assisted to mold this vast republic. They knew that the greatest good for the greatest number was the only safe legislative law, and that to it all exceptional cases must submit.

Gentlemen, in conclusion, a sophism in legislation is not a mere abstraction; it must speedily bear fruit in material results of the most disastrous nature, and I implore your honorable committee, in behalf of our common country, not to open a Pandora's box by way of experiment from whence so much evil must issue, and which once opened may never again be closed. Very respectfully,

MADELEINE VINTON DAHLGREN.

Mrs. Dahlgren was ably reviewed by Virginia L. Minor of St. Louis, and the Toledo Woman Suffrage Association. Mrs. Minor said:

In assuming to speak for the "silent masses" of women, Mrs. Dahlgren declares that silence does not give consent; very inconsequently forgetting, that if it does not on one side of the question, it may not on the other, and that she may no more represent them than do we.

The Toledo society, through its president Mrs. Rose L. Segur, said:

We agree with you that this grave question is not one of expediency. It is simply one of right and justice, and therefore a most legitimate subject for agitation. As a moral force woman must have a voice in the government, or partial and unjust legislation is the result from which arise the evils consequent upon a government based upon the enslavement of half its citizens.

To this Mrs. Dahlgren replied briefly, charging the ladies with incapacity to comprehend her.

The week following the convention a hearing was granted by the House Judiciary Committee to Dr. Mary Walker of Washington, Mary A. Tillotson of New Jersey and Mrs. N. Cromwell of Arkansas, urging a report in favor of woman's enfranchisement. On January 28, the House sub-committee on territories granted a hearing to Dr. Mary Walker and Sara Andrews Spencer, in opposition to the bill proposing the disfranchisement of the women of Utah as a means of suppressing polygamy.

On January 30 the House Judiciary Committee granted Mrs. Hooker a hearing. Of the eleven members of the committee nearly all were present.* The room and all the corridors leading to it were crowded with men and women eager to hear Mrs.

* The members of the committee present were Hon. Proctor Knott (the chairman), General Benjamin F. Butler, Messrs. Lynde, Frye, Conger, Lapham, Culberson, McMahon. Among the ladies were Mesdames Knott, Conger, Lynde, Frye.

Digitized by Google

Hooker's speech. At the close of the two hours occupied in its delivery, Chairman Knott thanked her in the name of the committee for her able argument.

Immediately after this hearing Mr. Frye of Maine, in presenting in the House of Representatives the petitions of 30,000 persons asking the right of women to vote upon the question of temperance, referred in a very complimentary manner to Mrs. Hooker's argument, to which he had just listened. Upon this prayer a hearing was granted to the president and ex-president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Frances E. Willard and Annie E. Wittenmyer.

Hon. George F. Hoar of Massachusetts, February 4, presented in the Senate the 120 petitions with their 6,261 signatures, which, by special request of its officers, had been returned to the headquarters of the American Association, in Boston. In her appeal to the friends to circulate the petitions, both State and national, Lucy Stone, chairman of its executive committee, said:

The American Suffrage Association has always recommended petitions to congress for a sixteenth amendment. But it recognizes the far greater importance of petitioning the State legislatures. *First*—Because suffrage is a subject referred by the constitution to the voters of each State. *Second*—Because we cannot expect a congress composed solely of representatives of States which deny suffrage to women, to submit an amendment which their own States have not yet approved. Just so it would have been impossible to secure the submission of negro suffrage by a congress composed solely of representatives from States which restricted suffrage to white men. While therefore we advise our friends to circulate both petitions together for signature, we urge them to give special prominence to those which apply to their own State legislatures, and to see that these are presented and urged by competent speakers next winter.

By request of a large number of the senators,* the Committee on Privileges and Elections granted a special hearing to Mrs. Hooker on Washington's birthday—February 22, 1878. It being understood that the wives of the senators were bringing all the forces of fashionable society to bear in aid of Mrs. Dahlgren's protest against the pending sixteenth amendment, the officers of the National Association issued cards of invitation asking their presence at this hearing. We copy from the Washington *Post:*

* Mrs. Hooker has won, just as we predicted she would. Senators Howe, Ferry, Coke, Randolph, Jones, Blaine, Beck, Booth, Allison, Wallace, Eaton, Johnston, Burnside, Saulsbury, Merrimon, and Presiding-officer Wheeler, together with nineteen other senators, have formally invited her to address the Committee on Privileges and Elections on February 22, an invitation which she has enthusiastically accepted. Nobody but congressmen will be admitted to hear the distinguished advocate of woman suffrage.—[Washington *Post.*

Digitized by Google

The conflicting rumors as to who would be admitted to hear Mrs. Hooker's argument before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, led to the assembling of large numbers of women in various places about the capitol yesterday morning. At 11 o'clock the doors were opened and the committee-room at once filled.* Mrs. Hooker, with the fervor and eloquence of her family, reviewed all the popular arguments against woman suffrage. She said she once believed that twenty years was little time enough for a foreigner to live in this country before he could cast a ballot. She understands the spirit of our institutions better now. If disfranchisement meant annihilation, there might be safety in disfranchising the poor, the ignorant, the vicious. But it does not. It means danger to everything we hold dear.

The corner-stone of this republic is God's own doctrine of liberty and responsibility. Liberty is the steam, responsibility the brakes, and election-day, the safety-valve. The foreigner comes to this country expecting to find it a paradise. He finds, indeed, a ladder reaching to the skies, but resting upon the earth, and he is at the bottom round. But on one day in the year he is as good as the richest man in the land. He can make the banker stand in the line behind him until he votes, and if he has wrongs he learns how to right them. If he has mistaken ideas of liberty, he is instructed what freedom means.

Wire-pulling politicians may well fear to have women enfranchised. There are too many of them, and they have had too much experience in looking after the details of their households to be easily duped by the tricks of politicians. You can't keep women away from primary meetings as you do intelligent men. Women know that every corner in the house must be inspected if the house is to be clean. Fathers and brothers want women to vote so that they can have a decent place for a primary meeting, a decent place to vote in and a decent man to vote for.

The Indian question would have been peacefully and righteously settled long ago without any standing army, if Lucretia Mott could have led in the councils of the nation, and the millions spent in fighting the Indians might have been used in kindergartens for the poor, to some lasting benefit. Down with the army, down with appropriation bills to repair the consequences of wrong-doing, when women vote. Millions more of women would ask for this if it were not for the cruelty and abuse men have heaped upon the advocates of woman suffrage. Men have made it a terrible martyrdom for women even to ask for their rights, and then say to us, "convert the women." No, no, men have put up the bars. They must take them down. Mrs. Hooker reviewed the Chinese ques-

* Among those present were Mrs. Senator Beck, Mrs. Stanley Matthews, Mrs. Sargent, Mrs. Spofford, Mrs. Holmes, Mrs. Snead, Mrs. Baldwin, Miss Blodgett of New York; Mrs. Baldwin, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Juan Lewis of Philadelphia; Mrs. Morgan of Mississippi, Mrs. Brooks, Mrs. Olcott, Mrs. Bartlett, Miss Sweet, Mrs. Myers, Mrs. Gibson, Miss Jenners, Mrs. Levison, Mrs. Hereford, Mrs. Folsom, Mrs. Mitchell, Mrs. Lynde, Mrs. Eldridge, Miss Snowe, Mrs. Curtis, Mrs. Hutchinson Patton, Mrs. Boucher and many others. Of the committee and Senate there were Senators Wadleigh, Cameron of Wisconsin; Merrimon, Mitchell, Hoar, Vice-president Wheeler, Senators Jones, Bruce, Beck and others. Several representatives and their wives also were there, and seemed deeply interested.—[Washington *Post*.

Digitized by Google

tion, the labor question, the subjects of compulsory education, reformation, police regulations, the social evil, and many other topics upon which men vainly attempt to legislate without the loving wisdom of mothers, sisters and daughters. The senators most interested in the argument were observed to be those previously most unfriendly to woman suffrage.

It was during this winter that Marilla M. Ricker of New Hampshire, then studying criminal law in Washington and already having quite an extensive practice, applied to the commissioners of the District of Columbia for an appointment as notary public. The question of the eligibility of woman to the office was referred to the district-attorney, Hon. Albert G. Riddle, formerly a member of congress from Ohio, and at that time one of the most prominent criminal and civil lawyers before the bar. Mr. Riddle's reply was an able and exhaustive argument, clearly showing there was no law to prevent women from holding the office. But notwithstanding this opinion from their own attorney, the commissioners rejected Mrs. Ricker's application.*

Bills to prohibit the Supreme Court from denying the admission of lawyers on the ground of sex had been introduced at each session of congress during the past four years. The House bill No. 1,077, entitled "A bill to relieve certain disabilities of women," was this year championed by Hon. John M. Glover of Missouri, and passed by a vote of 169 ayes to 87 nays. In the Senate, Hon. George F. Edmunds of Vermont, chairman of the Judiciary Committee reported adversely. While the question was pending, Mrs. Lockwood addressed a brief to the Senate, ably refuting the assertion of the Court that it was contrary to English precedent:

To the Honorable, the Senate of the United States:

The provisions of this bill are so stringent, that to the ordinary mind it would seem that the conditions are hard enough for the applicant to have well earned the honor of the preferment, without making *sex* a disability. The fourteenth amendment to the constitution declares that:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are *citizens* of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

* Mrs. Ricker makes a specialty of looking after the occupants of the jail—so freely is her purse opened to the poor and unfortunate that she is known as the prisoners' friend. Many an alleged criminal owes the dawning of a new life, and the determination to make it a worthy one, to the efforts of this noble woman. And Mrs. Ricker's special object in seeking this office was that prisoners might make depositions before her and thus be saved the expense of employing notaries from the city.

Digitized by Google

To deny the right asked in this bill would be to deny to women citizens the rights guaranteed in the Declaration of Independence to be self-evident and inalienable, "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness"; a denial of one of the fundamental rights of a portion of the citizens of the commonwealth to acquire property in the most honorable profession of the law, thereby perpetuating an invidious distinction between male and female citizens equally amenable to the law, and having an equal interest in all of the institutions created and perpetuated by this government. The articles of confederation declare that:

The free inhabitants of each of these States—paupers and fugitives from justice excepted—shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States.

Article 4 of the constitution says:

Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State.

Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Wyoming, Utah, and the District of Columbia admit women to the bar. What then? Shall the second coördinate branch of the government, the judiciary, refuse to grant what it will not permit the States to deny, the privileges and immunities of citizens, and say to women-attorneys when they have followed their cases through the State courts to that tribunal beyond which there is no appeal, "You cannot come in here we are too holy," or in the words of the learned chancellor declare that:

By the uniform practice of the court from its organization to the present time, and by a fair construction of its rules, none but men are admitted to practice before it as attorneys and counselors. This is in accordance with immemorial usage in England, and the law and practice in all the States until within a recent period, and the court does not feel called upon to make a change until such a change is required by statute, or a more extended practice in the highest courts of the States.

With all due respect for this opinion, we beg leave to quote the rule for admission to the bar of that court as laid down in the rule book:

RULE No. 2.—*Attorneys:* It shall be requisite to the admission of attorneys or counselors to practice in this court, that they shall have been such for three years past in the Supreme Courts of the States to which they respectively belong, and that their private and professional character shall appear to be fair.

There is nothing in this rule or in the oath which follows it, either express or implied, which confines the membership of the bar of the United States Supreme Court to the male sex. Had any such term been included therein it would virtually be nullified by the first paragraph of the United States Revised Statutes, ratified by the forty-third congress, June 20, 1875, in which occur the following words:

In determining the meaning of the Revised Statutes, or of any act or resolution of congress passed subsequent to February 25, 1871, words importing the singular number may extend and be applied to several persons or things; words importing the masculine gender may be applied to *females*, etc., etc.

Now, as to "immemorial usage in England." The executive branch of that government has been vested in an honored and honorable woman for the past forty years. Is it to be supposed if this distinguished lady

or any one of her accomplished daughters should ask to be heard at the bar of the Court of the Queen's Bench, the practice of which the United States Supreme Court has set up as its model, that she would be refused?

Blackstone recounts that Ann, Countess of Pembroke, held the office of sheriff of Westmoreland and exercised its duties in person. At the assizes at Appleby she sat with the judges on the bench. (See Coke on Lit., p. 326.) The Scotch sheriff is properly a judge, and by the statute 20, Geo., 11, c. 43, he must be a lawyer of three years standing.

Eleanor, Queen of Henry III. of England, in the year 1253, was appointed lady-keeper of the great seal, or the supreme chancellor of England, and sat in the *Aula Regia*, or King's Court. She in turn appointed Kilkenny, arch-deacon of Coventry, as the sealer of writs and common-law instruments, but the more important matters she executed in person.

Queen Elizabeth held the great seal at three several times during her remarkable reign. After the death of Lord-keeper Bacon she presided for two months in the *Aula Regia*.

It is claimed that "admission to the bar constitutes an office." Every woman postmaster, pension agent and notary public throughout the land is a bonded officer of the government. The Western States have elected women as school superintendents and appointed them as enrolling and engrossing clerks in their several legislatures, and as State librarians. Of what use are our seminaries and colleges for women if after they have passed through the curriculum of the schools there is for them no preferment, and no emolument; no application of the knowledge of the arts and sciences acquired, and no recognition of the excellence attained?

But this country, now in the second year of the second century of her history, is no longer in her leading strings, that she should look to Mother England for a precedent to do justice to the daughters of the land. She had to make a precedent when the first male lawyer was admitted to the bar of the United States Supreme Court. Ah! this country is one that has not hesitated when the necessity has arisen to make precedents and write them in blood. There was no precedent for this free republican government and the war of the rebellion; no precedent for the emancipation of the slave; no precedent for the labor strikes of last summer. The more extended practice, and the more extended public opinion referred to by the learned chancellor have already been accomplished. Ah! that very opinion, telegraphed throughout the land by the associated press, brought back the response of the people as on the wings of the wind asking you for that special act now so nearly consummated, which shall open this professional door to women.

BELVA A. LOCKWOOD, *Attorney and Solicitor.*

Washington, D. C., March 7, 1878.

Mrs. Lockwood's bill, with Senator Edmond's adverse report, was reached on the Senate calendar April 22, 1878, and provoked a spirited discussion. Hon. A. A. Sargent, made a gallant fight in favor of the bill, introducing the following amendment:

Digitized by Google

No person shall be excluded from practicing as an attorney and counselor at law in any court of the United States on account of sex.

Mr. SARGENT: Mr. President, the best evidence that members of the legal profession have no jealousy against the admission of women to the bar who have the proper learning, is shown by this document which I hold in my hand, signed by one hundred and fifty-five lawyers of the District of Columbia, embracing the most eminent men in the ranks of that profession. That there is no jealousy or consideration of impropriety on the part of the various States is shown by the fact that the legislatures of many of the States have recently admitted women to the bar; and my own State, California, has passed such a law within the last week or two; Illinois has done the same thing; so have Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri and North Carolina; and Wyoming, Utah and the District of Columbia among the territories have also done it. There is no reason in principle why women should not be admitted to this profession or the profession of medicine, provided they have the learning to enable them to be useful in those professions, and useful to themselves. Where is the propriety in opening our colleges, our higher institutions of learning, or any institutions of learning, to women, and then when they have acquired in the race with men the cultivation for higher employment, to shut them out? There certainly is none. We should either restrict the laws allowing the liberal education of women, or, we should allow them to exercise the talents which are cultivated at the public expense in such departments of enterprise and knowledge as will be useful to society and will enable them to gain a living. The tendency is in this direction. I believe the time has passed to consider it a ridiculous thing for women to appear upon the lecture platform or in the pulpit, for women to attend to the treatment of diseases as physicians and nurses, to engage in any literary employment, or appear at the bar. Some excellent women in the United States are now practicing at the bar, acceptably received before courts and juries; and when they have conducted their cases to a successful issue or an unsuccessful one in any court below, why should the United States courts to which an appeal may be taken and where their adversaries of the male sex may follow the case up, why should these courts be closed to these women? * * *

Mr. GARLAND: I should like to ask the senator from California if the courts of the United States cannot admit them upon their own motion anyhow?

Mr. SARGENT: I think there is nothing in the law prohibiting it, but the Supreme Court of the United States recently in passing upon the question of the admission of a certain lady, said that until some legislation took place they did not like to depart from the precedent set in England, or until there was more general practice among the States. The learned chief-justice, perhaps, did not sufficiently reflect when he stated that there were no English precedents. The fact is that Elizabeth herself sat in the *Aula Regia* and administered the law, and in both Scotland and England women have fulfilled the function of judges. The instances are not numerous but they are well established in history. I myself have had my

attention called to the fact that in the various States the women are now admitted by special legislation to the bar. I do not think there is anything in the law, properly considered, that would debar a woman from coming into this profession. I think the Supreme Court should not have required further legislation, but it seems to have done so, and that makes the necessity for the amendment which I have now offered.

The chairman of the committee in reporting this bill back from the Judiciary Committee said that the bill as it passed the House of Representatives gave privileges to women which men did not enjoy; that is to say, the Supreme Court can by a change of rule require further qualification of men, whereas in regard to women, if this provision were put into the statute, the Supreme Court could not rule them out even though it may be necessary in its judgment to get a higher standard of qualifications than its present rules prescribe. Although I observe that my time is up, I ask indulgence for a moment or two longer. As this is a question of some interest and women cannot appear here to speak for themselves, I hope I may be allowed to speak for them a moment. Now, there is something in the objection stated by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary—that is to say, the bill would take the rule of the Supreme Court and put it in the statute and apply it to women, thereby conferring exceptional privileges; but that is not my intention at all, and therefore I have proposed that women shall not be excluded from practicing law, if they are otherwise qualified, on account of sex, and that is the provision which I want to send back to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GARLAND: I wish to ask one question of the senator from California. Suppose the court should exclude women, but not on account of sex, then what is their remedy?

Mr. SARGENT: I do not see any pretense that the court could exclude them on except on account of sex.

Mr. GARLAND: If I recollect the rule of the Supreme Court in regard to the admission of practitioners (and I had to appear there twice to present my claim before I could carry on my profession in that court), I do not think any legislation is necessary to aid them by giving them any more access to that court than they have at present under the rules of the Supreme Court.

Mr. SARGENT: I believe if the laws now existing were properly construed (of course I speak with all deference to the Supreme Court, but I express the opinion) they would be admitted, but unfortunately the court does not take that view of it, and it will wait for legislation. I purpose that the legislation shall follow. If there is anything in principle why this privilege should not be granted to women who are otherwise qualified, then let the bill be defeated on that ground; but I say there is no difference in principle whatever, not the slightest. There is no reason because a citizen of the United States is a woman that she should be deprived of her rights as a citizen, and these are rights of a citizen. She has the same right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and employment, commensurate with her capacities, as a man has; and,

Digitized by Google

as to the question of capacity, the history of the world shows from Queen Elizabeth and Queen Isabella down to Madame Dudevant and Mrs. Stowe, that capacity is not a question of sex.

Mr. McDonald: I have simply to say, Mr. President, that a number of States and territories have authorized the admission of women to the legal profession, and they have become members of the bar of the highest courts of judicature. It may very frequently occur, and has in some instances I believe really occurred, that cases in which they have been thus employed have been brought to the Supreme Court of the United States. To have the door closed against them when the cause is brought here, not by them, or when in the prosecution of the suits of their clients they find it necessary to come here, seems to me entirely unjust. I therefore favor the bill with the amendment. The proposed amendment is perhaps better because it does away with any tendency to discrimination in regard to the admissibility of women to practice in the Supreme Court.

The Presiding Officer: The senator from California moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Judiciary.

Mr. Sargent: I have the promise of the chairman of the committee that the bill will soon be reported back, and therefore I am willing that it go to the committee, and I make the motion that it be recommitted. [The motion was agreed to.]

Mr. Sargent: I ask that the amendment which I propose be printed.

The Presiding Officer: The order to print will be made.

Mary Clemmer, the gifted correspondent of the New York *Independent*, learning that Senator Wadleigh was about to report adversely upon the sixteenth amendment, wrote the following private letter, which, as a record of her own sentiments on the question, she gave to Miss Anthony for publication in this history:

Hon. Bainbridge Wadleigh—*Dear Sir:* The more I think of it the more I regret that, as chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, you regard with less favor the enfranchisement of women than did your distinguished predecessor, Senator Morton. At this moment, when your committee is discussing that subject, I sigh for the large outlook, the just mind, the unselfish decision of that great legislator. You were his friend, you respected his intellect, you believed in his integrity, you sit in his seat. You are to prepare the report that he would prepare were he still upon the earth. May I ask you to bring to that labor as fair a spirit, as unprejudiced an outlook, as just a decision as he would have done?

I ask this not as a partisan of woman's rights, but as a lover of the human race. In this faint dawn of woman's day, I discern not woman's development of freedom merely, but the promise of that higher, finer, purer civilization which is to redeem the world, the lack of which makes men tyrants and women slaves. You cannot be unconscious of the fact that a new race of women is born into the world, who, while they lack no womanly attribute, are the peers of any man in intellect and aspiration.

Digitized by Google

It will be impossible long to deny to such women that equality before the law granted to the lowest creature that crawls, if he happens to be a man; denied to the highest creature that asks it, if she happens to be a woman.

On what authority, save that of the gross regality of physical strength, do you deny to a thoughtful, educated, tax-paying person the common rights of citizenship because she is a woman? I am a property-owner, the head of a household. By what right do you assume to define and curtail for me my prerogatives as a citizen, while as a tax-payer you make not the slightest distinction between me and a man? Leave to my own perception what is proper for me as a lady, to my own discretion what is wise for me as a woman, to my own conscience what is my duty to my race and to my God. Leave to unerring nature to protect the subtle boundaries which define the distinctive life and action of the sexes, while you as a legislator do everything in your power to secure to every creature of God an equal chance to make the best and most of himself.

If American men could say as Huxley says, "I scorn to lay a single obstacle in the way of those whom nature from the beginning has so heavily burdened," the sexes would cease to war, men and women would reign together, the equal companions, friends, helpers, and lovers that nature intended they should be. But what is love, tenderness, protection, even, unless rooted in justice? Tyranny and servitude, that is all. Brute supremacy, spiritual slavery. By what authority do you say that the country is not prepared for a more enlightened franchise, for political equality, if six women citizens, earnest, eloquent, long-suffering, come to you and demand both? No words can express my regret if to the minority report I see appended only the honored name of George F. Hoar of Massachusetts. Your friend, MARY CLEMMER.

In response to all these arguments, appeals and petitions, Senator Wadleigh, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, presented the following adverse report, June 14, 1878:

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred the Resolution (S. Res. 12) proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and certain Petitions for and Remonstrances against the same, make the following Report:

This proposed amendment forbids the United States, or any State to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of sex. If adopted, it will make several millions of female voters, totally inexperienced in political affairs, quite generally dependent upon the other sex, all incapable of performing military duty and without the power to enforce the laws which their numerical strength may enable them to make, and comparatively very few of whom wish to assume the irksome and responsible political duties which this measure thrusts upon them. An experiment so novel, a change so great, should only be made slowly and in response to a general public demand, of the existence of which there is no evidence before your committee.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Marilla M. Ricker.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1934 L

Petitions from various parts of the country, containing by estimate about 30,000 names, have been presented to congress asking for this legislation. They were procured through the efforts of woman suffrage societies, thoroughly organized, with active and zealous managers. The ease with which signatures may be procured to any petition is well known. The small number of petitioners, when compared with that of the intelligent women in the country, is striking evidence that there exists among them no general desire to take up the heavy burden of governing, which so many men seek to evade. It would be unjust, unwise and impolitic to impose that burden on the great mass of women throughout the country who do not wish for it, to gratify the comparatively few who do.

It has been strongly urged that without the right of suffrage, women are, and will be, subjected to great oppression and injustice.

But every one who has examined the subject at all knows that, without female suffrage, legislation for years has improved and is still improving the condition of woman. The disabilities imposed upon her by the common law have, one by one, been swept away, until in most of the States she has the full right to her property and all, or nearly all, the rights which can be granted without impairing or destroying the marriage relation. These changes have been wrought by the spirit of the age, and are not, generally at least, the result of any agitation by women in their own behalf.

Nor can women justly complain of any partiality in the administration of justice. They have the sympathy of judges and particularly of juries to an extent which would warrant loud complaint on the part of their adversaries of the sterner sex. Their appeals to legislatures against injustice are never unheeded, and there is no doubt that when any considerable part of the women of any State really wish for the right to vote, it will be granted without the intervention of congress.

Any State may grant the right of suffrage to women. Some of them have done so to a limited extent, and perhaps with good results. It is evident that in some States public opinion is much more strongly in favor of it than it is in others. Your committee regard it as unwise and inexpedient to enable three-fourths in number of the States, through an amendment to the national constitution, to force woman suffrage upon the other fourth in which the public opinion of both sexes may be strongly adverse to such a change.

For these reasons, your committee report back said resolution with a recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed.

This adverse report was all the more disappointing because Mr. Wadleigh, as Mrs. Clemmer's letter states, filled the place of Hon. Oliver P. Morton of Indiana, one of the most steadfast friends of woman suffrage, who, at the last session of congress, had asked as a special favor the reference of our petitions to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, of which he was chairman, that they might receive proper attention and that he might report favorably upon them. In the discussion on the Pembina

Digitized by Google

bill in 1874, Senator Morton made an earnest speech in favor of woman's enfranchisement. In his premature death our cause lost one of its bravest champions.

Senator Wadleigh's report called forth severe criticism; notably from the *New Northwest* of Oregon, the *Woman's Journal* of Boston, the *Inter-Ocean* of Chicago, the *Evening Telegram* and the *National Citizen* of New York. We quote from the latter:

The report is not a statesman-like answer based upon fundamental principles, but a mere politician's dodge—a species of dust-throwing quite in vogue in Washington. "Several millions of voters totally inexperienced in political affairs"! They would have about as much experience as the fathers in 1776, as the negroes in 1870, as the Irish, English, Italians, Norwegians, Danes, French, Germans, Portuguese, Scotch, Russians, Turks, Mexicans, Hungarians, Swedes and Indians, who form a good part of the voting population of this country. Did Mr. Wadleigh never hear of Agnes C. Jencks—the woman who has stirred up politics to its deepest depth; who has shaken the seat of President Hayes; who has set in motion the whole machinery of government, and who, when brought to the witness stand has for hours successfully baffled such wily politicians as Ben Butler and McMahon;—a woman who thwarts alike Republican and Democrat, and at her own will puts the brakes on all this turmoil of her own raising? Does Senator Wadleigh know nothing of that woman's "experience in politics"?

"Quite dependent upon the other sex." It used to be said the negroes were "quite dependent" upon their masters, that it would really be an abuse of the poor things to set them free, but when free and controlling the results of their own labor, it was found the masters had been the ones "quite dependent," and thousands of them who before the war rolled in luxury, have since been in the depths of poverty—some of them even dependent upon the bounty of their former slaves. When men cease to rob women of their earnings they will find them generally, as thousands now are, capable of self-care.*

"Military duty." When women hold the ballot there will not be quite as much military duty to be done. They will then have a voice and a vote in the matter, and the men will no longer be able to throw the country into a war to gratify spite or ambition, tearing from woman's arms her nearest and dearest. All men do not like "military duty." "The key to that horrible enigma, German socialism, is antagonism to

* THE SELFISH RATS—A FABLE BY LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE.—Once some gray old rats built a ship of State to save themselves from drowning. It carried them safely for awhile until they grew eager for more passengers, and so took on board all manner of rats that had run away from all sorts of places—Irish rats and German rats, and French rats, and even black rats and dirty sewer rats.

Now there were many lady mice who had followed the rats, and the rats therefore thought them very nice, but in spite of that would not let them have any place on the ship, so that they were forced to cling to a few planks and were every now and then overwhelmed by the waves. But when the mice begged to be taken on board saying, 'Save us also, we beg you!" The rats only replied, "We are too crowded already; we love you very much, and we know you are very uncomfortable, but it is not expedient to make room for you." So the rats sailed on safely and saw the poor little mice buffeted about without doing the least thing to save them.

Moral: Woe to the weaker.

Digitized by Google

the military system," and nations are shaken with fear because of it. But when there is necessity for military duty, women will be found in line. The person who planned the Tennessee campaign, in which the Northern armies secured their first victories, was a woman, Anna Ella Carroll. Gen. Grant acted upon her plan, and was successful. She was endorsed by President Lincoln, Seward, Stanton, Wade, Scott, and all the nation's leaders in its hour of peril, and yet congress has not granted her the pension which for ten years her friends have demanded. Mr. Wadleigh holds his seat in the United States Senate to-day, because of the "military duty" done by this woman.

"About 30,000 names," to petitions. There have been 70,000 sent in during the present session of congress, for a sixteenth amendment, besides hundreds of individual petitions from women asking for the removal of their own political disabilities. Men in this country are occasionally disfranchised for crime, and sometimes pray for the removal of their political disabilities. Nine such disfranchised men had the right of voting restored to them during the last session of congress. But not a single one of the five hundred women who individually asked to have their political disabilities removed, was even so much as noticed by an adverse report. Mr. Wadleigh knows it would make no difference if 300,000 women petitioned. But whether women ask for the ballot or not has nothing to do with the question. Self-government is the natural right of every individual, and because woman possesses this natural right, she should be secured in its exercise.

Mr. Wadleigh says, "nor can woman justly complain of any partiality in the administration of justice." Let us examine: A few years ago a married man in Washington, in official position, forced a confession from his wife at the mouth of a pistol, and shot his rival dead. Upon trial he was triumphantly acquitted and afterwards sent abroad as foreign minister. A few months ago a married woman in Georgia, who had been taunted by her rival with boasts of having gained her husband's love, found this rival dancing with him. She drew a knife and killed the woman on the spot. She was tried, convicted, and, although nursing one infant, and again about to become a mother, was sentenced to be hanged by the neck till she was 'dead, dead, dead.' There is Mr. Wadleigh's equal administration of justice between man and woman! There is "the sympathy of judges and juries." There is the "extent which would warrant loud complaint on the part of their adversaries of the sterner sex." And this woman escaped the gallows not because of "the sympathy of the judge" or "jury," but because her own sex took the matter up, and from every part of the country sent petitions by the hundreds to Governor Colquitt of Georgia, asking her pardon. That pardon came in the shape of ten years' imprisonment;—ten years in a cell for a woman, the mother of a nursing and an unborn infant, while for General Sickles the mission to Madrid with high honors and a fat salary.

Messrs. Wadleigh of New Hampshire, McMillan of Minnesota, Ingalls of Kansas, Saulsbury of Delaware, Merrimon of North Carolina and Hill of Georgia, all senators of the United States, are the committee that re-

Digitized by Google

port it "inexpedient" to secure equal rights to the women of the United States. But we are not discouraged; we are not disheartened; all the Wadleighs in the Senate, all the committees of both Houses, the whole congress of the United States against us, would not lessen our faith, nor our efforts. We know we are right; we know we shall be successful; we know the day is not far distant, when this government and the world will acknowledge the exact and permanent political equality of man and woman, and we know that until that hour comes woman will be oppressed, degraded; a slave, without a single right that man feels himself bound to respect. Work then, women, for your own freedom. Let the early morning see you busy, and dusky evening find you planning how you may become FREE.

But the most severe judgment upon Mr Wadleigh's action came from his own constituents, who, at the close of the forty-fifth congress excused his further presence in the United States Senate, sending in his stead the Hon Henry W. Blair, a valiant champion of national protection for national citizens.*

In April, 1878, Mrs. Williams transferred the *Ballot-Box* to Mrs. Gage, who removed it to Syracuse, New York, and changed its name to the *National Citizen.* In her prospectus Mrs. Gage said:

The *National Citizen* will advocate the principle that suffrage is the citizen's right, and should be protected by national law, and that, while States may regulate the suffrage, they should have no power to abolish it. Its especial object will be to secure national protection to women in the exercise of their right to vote; it will oppose class legislation of whatever form. It will support no political party until one arises which is based upon the exact equality of man and woman.

As the first step towards becoming well is to know you are ill, one of the principal aims of the *National Citizen* will be to make those women discontented who are now content; to waken them to self-respect and a desire to use the talents they possess; to educate their consciences aright; to quicken their sense of duty; to destroy morbid beliefs, and fit them for their high responsibilities as citizens of a republic. The *National Citizen* has no faith in that old theory that "a woman once lost is lost forever," neither does it believe in the assertion that "a woman who sins, sinks to depths of wickedness lower than man can reach." On the contrary it believes there is a future for the most abandoned, if only the kindly hand of love and sympathy be extended to rescue them from the degradation into which they have fallen. The *National Citizen* will endeavor to keep its readers informed of the progress of women in foreign countries, and will, as far as possible, revolutionize this country, striving to make it live up to its own fundamental principles and become in reality what it is but in name—a genuine republic.

* Senator Blair has just been elected (June, 1885) to a second term, thus insuring his services to our cause in the Senate for another six years.

Digitized by Google

Instead of holding its usual May anniversary in New York city, the National Association decided to meet in Rochester to celebrate the close of the third decade of organized agitation in the United States, and issued the following call:

The National Association will hold a convention in Rochester, N. Y., July 19, 1878. This will be the thirtieth anniversary of the first woman's rights convention, held July 19, 1848, in the Wesleyan church at Seneca Falls, N. Y., and adjourned to meet, August 2, in Rochester. Some who took part in that convention have passed away, but many others, including both Mrs. Mott and Mrs. Stanton, are still living. This convention will take the place of the usual May anniversary, and will be largely devoted to reminiscences. Friends are cordially invited to be present.

CLEMENCE S. LOZIER, M. D., *President.*

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Chairman Executive Committee.*

The meeting was held in the Unitarian church on Fitzhugh street, occupied by the same society that had opened its doors in 1848; and Amy Post, one of the leading spirits of the first convention, still living in Rochester and in her seventy-seventh year, assisted in the arrangements. Rochester, known as "The Flower City," contributed of its beauty to the adornment of the church. It was crowded at the first session. Representatives from a large number of States were present,* and there was a pleasant interchange of greetings between those whose homes were far apart, but who were friends and co-workers in this great reform. The reunion was more like the meeting of near and dear relatives than of strangers whose only bond was work in a common cause. Such are the compensations which help to sustain reformers while they battle ignorance and prejudice in order to secure justice. In the absence of the president, Dr. Clemence S. Lozier, Mrs. Stanton took the chair and said:

We are here to celebrate the third decade of woman's struggle in this country for liberty. Thirty years have passed since many of us now

* DELEGATES TO THE THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY.—Alabama, Priscilla Holmes Drake; California, Ellen Clark Sargent; District of Columbia, Frederick Douglass, Belva A. Lockwood, Sara Andrews Spencer, Caroline B. Winslow, M. D.; Indiana, Margaret C. Conklin, Mary B. Naylor, May Wright Thompson; Massachusetts, Harriet H. Robinson, Harriette R. Shattuck; Maryland, Lavinia C. Dundore; Michigan, Catherine A. F. Stebbins, Frances Titus, Sojourner Truth; Missouri, Phoebe W. Couzins; New Hampshire, Parker Pillsbury; North Carolina, Elizabeth Oakes Smith; New Jersey, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Sarah M. Hurn; New York, *Albany county*, Arethusa L. Forbes; *Dutchess*, Helen M. Loder; *Lewis*, Mrs. E. M. Wilcox; *Madison*, Helen Raymond Jarvis; *Monroe*, Susan B. Anthony, Amy Post, Sarah H. Willis, Mary H. Hallowell, Mary S. Anthony, Lewia C. Smith and many others; *Orleans*, Mrs. Plumb, Mrs. Clark; *Onondaga*, Lucy N. Coleman, Dr. Amelia F. Raymond, Matilda Joslyn Gage; *Ontario*, Elizabeth C. Atwell, Catherine H. Sands, Elizabeth Smith Miller, Helen M. Pitts; *Queens*, Mary A. Pell; *Wayne*, Sarah K. Rathbone, Rebecca B. Thomas; *Wyoming*, Charlotte A. Cleveland; *Genesee*, the Misses Morton; *New York*, Clemence S. Lozier, M. D., Helen M. Slocum, Sara A. Barret, M. D., Hamilton Wilcox; Ohio, Mrs. Ellen Sully Fray; Pennsylvania, Lucretia Mott, Sarah Pugh, Adeline Thomson, Maria C. Arter, M. D., Mrs. Watson; South Carolina, Martha Schofield; Wisconsin, Mrs. C. L. Morgan.

Digitized by Google

present met in this place to discuss the true position of woman as a citizen of a republic. The reports of our first conventions show that those who inaugurated this movement understood the significance of the term "citizens." At the very start we claimed full equality with man. Our meetings were hastily called and somewhat crudely conducted; but we intuitively recognized the fact that we were defrauded of our natural rights, conceded in the national constitution. And thus the greatest movement of the century was inaugurated. I say greatest, because through the elevation of woman all humanity is lifted to a higher plane. To contrast our position thirty years ago, under the old common law of England, with that we occupy under the advanced legislation of to-day, is enough to assure us that we have passed the boundary line—from slavery to freedom. We already see the mile-stones of a new civilization on every highway.

Look at the department of education, the doors of many colleges and universities thrown wide open to women; girls contending for, yea, and winning prizes over their brothers. In the working world they are rapidly filling places and climbing heights unknown to them before, realizing, in fact, the dreams, the hopes, the prophesies of the inspired women of by-gone centuries. In many departments of learning woman stands the peer of man, and when by higher education and profitable labor she becomes self-reliant and independent, then she must and will be free. The moment an individual or a class is strong enough to stand alone, bondage is impossible. Jefferson Davis, in a recent speech, says: "A Cæsar could not subject a people fit to be free, nor could a Brutus save them if they were fit for subjugation."

Looking back over the past thirty years, how long ago seems that July morning when we gathered round the altar in the old Wesleyan church in Seneca Falls! It taxes and wearies the memory to think of all the conventions we have held, the legislatures we have besieged, the petitions and tracts we have circulated, the speeches, the calls, the resolutions we have penned, the never-ending debates we have kept up in public and private, and yet to each and all our theme is as fresh and absorbing as it was the day we started. Calm, benignant, subdued as we look on this platform, if any man should dare to rise in our presence and controvert a single position we have taken, there is not a woman here that would not in an instant, with flushed face and flashing eye, bristle all over with sharp, pointed arguments that would soon annihilate the most skilled logician, the most profound philosopher.

To those of you on this platform who for these thirty years have been the steadfast representatives of woman's cause, my friends and co-laborers, let me say our work has not been in vain. True, we have not yet secured the suffrage, but we have aroused public thought to the many disabilities of our sex, and our countrywomen to higher self-respect and worthier ambition, and in this struggle for justice we have deepened and broadened our own lives and extended the horizon of our vision. Ridiculed, persecuted, ostracised, we have learned to place a just estimate on popular opinion, and to feel a just confidence in ourselves. As the representatives

Digitized by Google

of principles which it was necessary to explain and defend, we have been compelled to study constitutions and laws, and in thus seeking to redress the wrongs and vindicate the rights of the many, we have secured a higher development for ourselves. Nor is this all. The full fruition of these years of seed-sowing shall yet be realized, though it may not be by those who have led in the reform, for many of our number have already fallen asleep. Another decade and not one of us may be here, but we have smoothed the rough paths for those who come after us. The lives of multitudes will be gladdened by the sacrifices we have made, and the truths we have uttered can never die.

Standing near the gateway of the unknown land and looking back through the vista of the past, memory recalls many duties in life's varied relations we would had been better done. The past to all of us is filled with regrets. We can recall, perchance, social ambitions disappointed, fond hopes wrecked, ideals in wealth, power, position, unattained—much that would be considered success in life unrealized. But I think we should all agree that the time, the thought, the energy we have devoted to the freedom of our countrywomen, that the past, in so far as our lives have represented this great movement, brings us only unalloyed satisfaction. The rights already obtained, the full promise of the rising generation of women more than repay us for the hopes so long deferred, the rights yet denied, the humiliation of spirit we still suffer.

And for those of you who have been mere spectators of the long, hard battle we have fought, and are still fighting, I have a word. Whatever your attitude has been, whether as cold, indifferent observers—whether you have hurled at us the shafts of ridicule or of denunciation, we ask you now to lay aside your old educational prejudices and give this question your earnest consideration, substituting reason for ridicule, sympathy for sneers. I urge the young women especially to prepare themselves to take up the work so soon to fall from our hands. You have had opportunities for education such as we had not. You hold to-day the vantage-ground we have won by argument. Show now your gratitude to us by making the uttermost of yourselves, and by your earnest, exalted lives secure to those who come after you a higher outlook, a broader culture, a larger freedom than have yet been vouchsafed to woman in our own happy land.

Congratulatory letters* and telegrams were received from all portions of the United States and from the old world. Space

* From Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison, Lucy Stone, Caroline H. Dall, Boston; Hon. A. A. Sargent, Washington; Clara Barton, Mathilde F. Wendt, Abby Hutchinson Patton, Aaron M. Powell, Father Benson, Margaret Holley, Mary L. Booth, Sarah Hallock, Priscilla R. Lawrence, Lillie Devereux Blake, New York; Samuel May, Elizabeth Powell Bond, John W. Hutchinson, Lucinda B. Chandler, Sarah E. Wall, Massachusetts; Caroline M. Spear, Robert Purvis, Edward M. Davis Philadelphia; Isabella Beecher Hooker, Julia E. Smith, Lavinia Goodell, Connecticut; Lucy A Snowe, Ann T. Greeley, Maine; Caroline F. Barr, Bessie Bisbee Hunt, Mary A. Powers Filley, New Hampshire; Catherine Cornell Knowles, Rhode Island; Antoinette Brown Blackwell, New Jersey; Annie Laura Quinby, Joseph B. Quinby, Sarah R. L. Williams, Rosa L. Segur, Ohio; Sarah C. Owen, Michigan; Laura Rosa Wolcott, M. D., Mary King, Angie King, Wisconsin; Frances E. Williard, Clara Lyons Peters, Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Illinois; Rachel Lockwood Child, Janet Strong, Nancy R. Allen, Amelia Bloomer, Iowa; Sarah Burger Stearns, Hattie M. White, Minnesota; Mary F. Thomas, M. D., Emma Molloy, Indiana; Matilda Hindman, Sarah L. Miller, Pennsylvania; Anna K. Irvine, Virginia

Digitized by Google

admits the publication of but a few, yet all breathed the same hopeful spirit and confidence in future success. Abigail Bush, who presided over the first Rochester convention, said:

No one knows what I passed through upon that occasion. I was born and baptized in the old Scotch Presbyterian church. At that time its sacred teachings were, "if a woman would know anything let her ask her husband at home." * * * I well remember the incidents of that meeting and the thoughts awakened by it. * * * Say to your convention my full heart is with them in all their deliberations and counsels, and I trust great good to women will come of their efforts.

Ernestine L. Rose, a native of Poland, and, next to Frances Wright, the earliest advocate of woman's enfranchisement in America, wrote from England:

How I should like to be with you at the anniversary—it reminds me of the delightful convention we had at Rochester, long, long ago—and speak of the wonderful change that has taken place in regard to woman. Compare her present position in society with the one she occupied *forty* years ago, when I undertook to emancipate her from not only barbarous laws, but from what was even worse, a barbarous public opinion. No one can appreciate the wonderful change in the social and moral condition of woman, except by looking back and comparing the past with the present. * * * Say to the friends, Go on, go on, halt not and rest not. Remember that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" and of right. Much has been achieved; but the main, the vital thing, has yet to come. The suffrage is the magic key to the statute—the insignia of citizenship in a republic.

Caroline Ashurst Biggs, editor of the *Englishwoman's Review*, London, wrote:

I have read with great interest in the *National Citizen* and the *Woman's Journal* the announcement of the forthcoming convention in Rochester. * * * I cannot refrain from sending you a cordial English congratulation upon the great advance in the social and legal position of women in America, which has been the result of your labor. The next few years will see still greater progress. As soon as the suffrage is granted to women, a concession which will not be many years in coming either in England or America, every one of our questions will advance with double force, and meanwhile our efforts in that direction are simultaneously helping forward other social, legal, educational and

---

L. Minor, Missouri; Elizabeth H. Duvall, Kentucky; Mrs. G. W. Church, Tennessee; Mrs. Augusta Williams, Elsie Stuart, Kansas; Ada W. Lucas, Nebraska; Emeline B. Wells. Annie Godbe, Utah; Mary F. Shields, Alida C. Avery, M. D., Colorado; Harriet Loughary, Mrs. L. F. Proebstel, Mrs. Coburn, Abigail Scott Duniway, Oregon; Clarina I. H. Nichols, Elizabeth B. Schenck, Sarah J. Wallis, Abigail Bush, Laura de Force Gordon, California; Mrs. A. H. H. Stuart, Washington Territory; Helen M. Martin, Arkansas; Helen R. Holmes, District of Columbia; Caroline V. Putnam, Virginia; Elizabeth Avery Meriwether, Tennessee; Elizabeth L. Saxon, Louisiana; Martha Goodwin Tunstall, Texas; Priscilla Holmes Drake, Buell D. M'Clung, Alabama, Ellen Sully Fray, Ontario; Theodore Stanton, France; Ernestine L. Rose, Caroline Ashurst Biggs, Lydia E. Becker, England.

Digitized by Google

moral reforms. Our organization in England does not date back so far as yours. There were only a few isolated thinkers when Mrs. John Stuart Mill wrote her essay on the enfranchisement of women in 1851. For twenty years, however, it has progressed with few drawbacks. In some particulars the English laws in respect of women are in advance of yours, but the connection between England and America is so close that a gain to one is a gain to the other.

Lydia E. Becker, editor of the *Women's Suffrage Journal*, Manchester, England, wrote:

* * * I beg to offer to the venerable pioneers of the movement, more especially to Lucretia Mott, a tribute of respectful admiration and gratitude for the services they have rendered in the cause of enfranchisement. * * * As regards the United kingdom, the movement in a practical form is but twelve years old, and in that period, although we have not obtained the parliamentary franchise, we have seen it supported by at least one-third of the House of Commons, and our claim admitted as one which must be dealt with in future measures of parliamentary reform. We have obtained the municipal franchise and the school-board franchise. Women have secured the right to enter the medical profession and to take degrees in the University of London, besides considerable amendment of the law regarding married women, though much remains to be done.

Senator Sargent, since minister to Berlin, wrote:

I regret that the necessity to proceed at once to California will deprive me of the pleasure of attending your convention of July 19, the anniversary of the spirited declaration of rights put forth thirty years ago by some of the noblest and most enlightened women of America. Women's rights have made vast strides since that day, in juster legislation, in widened spheres of employment, and in the gradual but certain recognition by large numbers of citizens of the justice and policy of extending the elective franchise to women. It is now very generally conceded that the time is rapidly approaching when women will vote. The friends of the movement have faith in the result; its enemies grudgingly admit it. Courage and work will hasten the day. The worst difficulties have already been overcome. The movement has passed the stage of ridicule, and even that of abuse, and has entered that of intelligent discussion, its worst adversaries treating it with respect. You are so familiar with all the arguments in favor of this great reform that I will not attempt to state them; but I wish to say that as an observer of public events, it is my deliberate judgment that your triumph is near at hand. There are vastly more men and women in the United States now who believe that women should have the right to vote than there were in 1848 who believed the slave should be freed. This is a government of opinions and the growing opinion will be irresistible. Respectfully yours, A. A. SARGENT.

The following letters from the great leaders of the anti-slavery movement were gratefully received. As Mr. Garrison soon after

finished his eventful life, this proved to be his last message to our association:

BOSTON, June 30, 1878.

MY DEAR MISS ANTHONY—Your urgent and welcome letter, inviting me to the thirtieth anniversary of the woman's rights movement at Rochester, came yesterday. Most earnestly do I wish I could be present to help mark this epoch in our movement, and join in congratulating the friends on the marvelous results of their labors. No reform has gathered more devoted and self-sacrificing friends. No one has had lives more generously given to its service; and you who have borne such heavy burdens may well rejoice in the large harvest; for no reform has, I think, had such rapid success. You who remember the indifference which almost discouraged us in 1848, and who have so bravely faced ungenerous opposition and insult since, must look back on the result with unmixed astonishment and delight. Temperance, and finance—which is but another name for the labor movement—and woman's rights, are three radical questions which overtop all others in value and importance. Woman's claim for the ballot-box has had a much wider influence than merely to protect woman. Universal suffrage is itself in danger. Scholars dread it: social science and journalists attack it. The discussion of woman's claim has done much to reveal this danger, and rally patriotic and thoughtful men in defense. In many ways the agitation has educated the people. Its success shows that the masses are sound and healthy; and if we gain, in the coming fifteen years, half as much as we have in the last thirty, woman will hold spear and shield in her own hands. If I might presume to advise, I should say close up the ranks and write on our flag only one claim—the ballot. Everything helps us, and if we are united, success cannot long be delayed. Very cordially yours,

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

BOSTON, July 16, 1878.

MY DEAR FRIEND—The thirtieth anniversary of the first woman's rights convention ever held with special reference to demanding the elective franchise irrespective of sex, well deserves to be commemorated in the manner set forth in the call for the same, at Rochester, on the 19th instant. As a substitute for my personal attendance, I can only send a brief but warm congratulatory epistle on the cheering progress which the movement has made within the period named. For how widely different are the circumstances under which that convention was held, and those which attend the celebration of its third decade! Then, the assertion of civil and political equality, alike for men and women, excited widespread disgust and astonishment, as though it were a proposition to repeal the laws of nature, and literally to "turn the world upside down"; and it was ridiculed and caricatured as little short of lunacy. Now, it is a subject of increasing interest and grave consideration, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and what at first appeared to be so foolish in pretension is admitted by all reflecting and candid minds to be deserving of the most respectful treatment. Then, its avowed friends, were indeed "few and far

Digitized by Google

between," even among those disfranchised as the penalty of their womanhood. Now, they can be counted by tens of thousands, and their number is augmenting—foremost in intelligence, in weight of character, in strength of understanding, in manly and womanly development, and in all that goes to make up enlightened citizenship. Then, with rare exceptions, women were everywhere remanded to poverty and servile dependence, being precluded from following those avocations and engaging in those pursuits which make competency and independence not a difficult achievement. Now, there is scarcely any situation or profession, in the arrangements of society, to which they may not and do not aspire, and in which many of them are not usefully engaged; whether in new and varied industrial employment, in the arts and sciences, in the highest range of literature, in philosophic and mathematical investigations, in the professions of law, medicine, and divinity, in high scholarship, in educational training and supervision, in rhetoric and oratory, in the lyceum, or in discharging the official duties connected with the various departments of the State and national governments.

Almost all barriers are down except that which prevents women from going to the polls to help decide who shall be the law-makers and what shall be the laws, so that the general welfare may be impartially consulted, and the blessings of freedom and equal rights be enjoyed by all. That barrier, too, must give way wherever erected, as sure as time outlasts and baffles every device of wrong-doing, and truth is stronger than falsehood, and the law of eternal justice is as reliable as the law of gravitation. Yes! the grand fundamental truths of the Declaration of Independence shall yet be reduced to practice in our land—that the human race are created free and equal; that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, and that taxation without representation is tyranny. And I confidently predict that this will be witnessed before the expiration of another decade.

Yours, to abate nothing of heart or hope,

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

Mrs. Mott never seemed more hopeful for the triumph of our principles than on this occasion. She expressed great satisfaction in the number of young women who for the first time that day graced our platform.* Though in her eighty-sixth year, her enthusiasm in the cause for which she had so long labored seemed still unabated, and her eye sparkled with humor as of yore while giving some amusing reminiscences of encounters with opponents in the early days. Always apt in biblical quotations she had proved herself a worthy antagonist of the clergy on our platform. She had slain many Abimelechs with short texts of Scripture,

* While May Wright Thompson was speaking she turned to Mrs. Stanton and said. "How thankful I am for these bright young women now ready to fill our soon-to-be vacant places. I want to shake hands with them all before I go, and give them a few words of encouragement. I do hope they will not be spoiled with too much praise."

Digitized by Google

whose defeat was the more humiliating because received at the hand of a woman. As she recounted in her happiest vein the triumphs of her coadjutors she was received with the heartiest manifestations of delight by her auditors. She took a lively interest in the discussion of the resolutions that had been presented by the chairman of the committee, Matilda Joslyn Gage:

Resolved, That a government of the people, by the people and for the people is yet to be realized; for that which is formed, administered and controlled only by men, is practically nothing more than an enlarged oligarchy, whose assumptions of natural superiority and of the right to rule are as baseless as those enforced by the aristocratic powers of the old world.

Resolved, That in celebrating our third decade we have reason to congratulate ourselves on the marked change in woman's position—in her enlarged opportunities for education and labor, her greater freedom under improved social customs and civil laws, and the promise of her speedy enfranchisement in the minor political rights she has already secured.

Resolved, That the International Congress * called in Paris, July 20, to discuss the rights of woman—the eminent Victor Hugo, its presiding officer—is one of the most encouraging events of the century, in that statesmen and scholars from all parts of the world, amid the excitement of the French Exposition, propose to give five days to deliberations upon this question.

Resolved, That the majority report of the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, Senator Wadleigh of New Hampshire, against a sixteenth amendment to secure the political rights of woman in its weakness, shows the strength of our reform.

Resolved, That the national effort to force citizenship on the Indians, the decision of Judge Sawyer in the United States Circuit Court of California against the naturalization of the Chinese, and the refusal of congress to secure the right of suffrage to women, are class legislation, dangerous to the stability of our institutions.

WHEREAS, Woman's rights and duties in all matters of legislation are the same as those of man,

Resolved, That the problems of labor, finance, suffrage, international rights, internal improvements, and other great questions, can never be satisfactorily adjusted without the enlightened thought of woman, and her voice in the councils of the nation.

Resolved, That the question of capital and labor is one of special interest to us. Man, standing to woman in the position of capitalist, has robbed her through the ages of the results of her toil. No just settlement of this question can be attained until the right of woman to the proceeds of her labor in the family and elsewhere is recognized, and she is welcomed into every industry on the basis of equal pay for equal work.

Resolved, That as the first duty of every individual is self-development, the lessons of self-sacrifice and obedience taught woman by the Christian church have been fatal, not only to her own vital interests, but through her, to those of the race.

Resolved, That the great principle of the Protestant Reformation, the right of individual conscience and judgment heretofore exercised by man alone, should now be claimed by woman; that, in the interpretation of Scripture, she should be guided by her own reason, and not by the authority of the church.

Resolved, That it is through the perversion of the religious element in woman—playing upon her hopes and fears of the future, holding this life with all its high duties in abeyance to that which is to come—that she and the children she has trained have been so completely subjugated by priestcraft and superstition.

---

* For account of this International Congress, see chapter on Continental Europe in this volume.

Digitized by Google

This was the last convention ever attended by Lucretia Mott. Her family had specially requested that she should not be urged to go; but on seeing the call, she quietly announced her intention to be at the meeting, and, with the ever faithful Sarah Pugh as her companion, she made the journey from Philadelphia in the intense heat of those July days. Mrs. Mott was the guest of her husband's nephew, Dr. E. M. Moore, who, fearing that his aunt would be utterly exhausted, called for her while she was in the midst of her closing remarks. As she descended the platform, she continued speaking while she slowly moved down the aisle, shaking hands upon either side. The audience simultaneously rose, and on behalf of all, Frederick Douglass ejaculated, "Good-by, dear Lucretia!"

The last three resolutions called out a prolonged discussion * not only in the convention but from the pulpit and press of the State.

One amusing encounter in the course of the debate is worthy of note. Perhaps it was due to the intense heat that Mr. Douglass, usually clear on questions of principle, was misled into opposing the resolutions. He spoke with great feeling and religious sentiment of the beautiful Christian doctrine of self-sacrifice. When he finished, Mrs. Lucy Coleman, always keen in pricking bubbles, arose and said: "Well, Mr. Douglass, all you say may be true; but allow me to ask you why you did not remain a slave in Maryland, and sacrifice yourself, like a Christian, to your master, instead of running off to Canada to secure your liberty, like a man? We shall judge your faith, Frederick, by your deeds."

An immense audience assembled at Corinthian Hall in the evening to listen to the closing speeches † of the convention. Mrs. Robinson of Boston gave an exhaustive review of the work in Massachusetts, and her daughter, Mrs. Shattuck, gave many amusing experiences as her father's ‡ clerk in the legislature of that State.

The resolutions provoked many attacks from the clergy throughout the State, led by Rev. A. H. Strong, D. D., president of the Baptist Theological Seminary in Rochester, Of his sermon the *National Citizen* said:

---

* Mrs. Mott, Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Coleman, Mr. Wilcox, Mrs. Slocum, Mrs. Dundore, Mrs. Stebbins, Mrs. Sands, Mrs. Amy Post, and Mrs. Elizabeth Oakes-Smith, who having resided in North Carolina had not been on our platform for many years, were among the speakers.

† By Miss Couzins, Mr. Douglass, Mrs. Spencer.

‡ Mr. Robinson, as "Warrington," was well known as one of the best writers on the *Springfield Republican.*

Digitized by Google

None too soon have we issued our resolutions, proclaiming woman's right to self-development—to interpret Scripture for herself, to use her own faculties. In speaking of what Christianity has done for woman, Dr. Strong stultifies his own assertions by referring to Switzerland and Germany "where you may see any day hundreds of women wheeling earth for railroad embankments." Does he not remember that Switzerland and Germany are Christian countries and that it is part of their civilization that while women do this work, some man takes the pay and puts it in his own pocket quite in heathen fashion? The reverend doctor in the usual style of opposition to woman—which is to quote something or other having no bearing upon the question—refers to Cornelia's "jewels," forgetting to say that Cornelia delivered public lectures upon philosophy in Rome, and that Cicero paid the very highest tribute to her learning and genius.

Dr. Strong advocates the old theory that woman and man are not two classes standing upon the same level, but that the two are one—that one on the time-worn theory of common law, the husband; and talks of the "dignity and delicacy of woman" being due to the fact of her not having been in public life, and that this "dignity and delicacy" would all evaporate if once she were allowed to vote, which reminds one of the story of Baron Munchausen's horn, into which a certain coach-driver blew all manner of wicked tunes. The weather being very cold, these tunes remained frozen in the horn. When hung by the fire, the horn began to thaw out, and these wicked tunes came pealing forth to the great amazement of the by-standers. The reverend gentlemen seems to think women are full of frozen wickedness, which if they enter public life will be thawed out to the utter demolition of their "dignity and delicacy" and the disgust of society. He deems it "too hazardous" to allow women to vote. "Bad women would vote." Well, what of it? Have they not equal right with bad men, to self-government? Bad is a relative term. It strikes us that the very reverend Dr. Strong is a "bad" man—a man who does not understand true Christianity—who is not just—who would strike those who are down—who would keep woman in slavery—who quotes the Bible as his authority: thus fettering woman's conscience, binding her will, and playing upon her hopes and fears to keep her in subjection.

From Augustine, down, theologians have tried to compel people to accept their special interpretation of the Scripture, and the tortures of the inquisition, the rack, the thumb-screw, the stake, the persecutions of witchcraft, the whipping of naked women through the streets of Boston, banishment, trials for heresy, the halter about Garrison's neck, Lovejoy's death, the branding of Captain Walker, shouts of infidel and atheist, have all been for this purpose.

We know the ignorance that exists upon these points. Few have yet begun to comprehend the influence that ecclesiasticism has had upon law. Wharton, a recognized authority upon criminal law, issued his seventh edition before he ascertained the vast bearing canon law had had upon the civil code, and we advise readers to consult the array of authorities, English, Latin, German, to which he, in his preface, refers. We hope to

Digitized by Google

arouse attention and compel investigation of this subject by lawyers and theologians as well as by women themselves.

Francis E. Abbot, editor of *The Index*, the organ of the Free Religious Association, spoke grandly in favor of the resolutions. He said:

These resolutions we have read with astonishment, admiration and delight. We should not have believed it possible that the convention could have been induced to adopt them. They will make forever memorable in the history of the organized woman movement, this thirtieth anniversary of its birth. They put the National Woman Suffrage Association in an inconceivably higher and nobler position than that occupied by any similar society. They go to the very root of the matter. They are a bold, dignified, and magnificent utterance. We congratulate the convention on a record so splendid in the eyes of all true liberals. From this day forth the whole woman movement must obey the inspiration of a higher courage and a grander spirit than have been known to its past. Opposition must be encountered, tenfold more bitter than was ever yet experienced. But truth is on the side of these brave women; the ringing words they have spoken at Rochester will thrill many a doubting heart and be echoed far down the long avenue of the years.

During the same week of the Rochester convention, the Paris International Congress opened it sessions, sending us a telegram of greeting to which we responded with two hundred and fifty francs as a tangible evidence of our best wishes. The two remarkable features of that congress were the promise of so distinguished a man as Victor Hugo to preside over its deliberations, though at last prevented by illness; and the fact that the Italian government sent Mlle. Mozzoni as an official delegate to the congress to study the civil position of woman in various countries, in order that an ameliorating change of its code, in respect to woman, could be wisely made.

The newspapers of the French capital in general treated the congress with respect. The *Rappel*, Victor Hugo's organ, spoke of it in a most complimentary manner. Theodore Stanton, in a letter to the *National Citizen*, said:

In one important respect this congress differed entirely from an American convention of like character—it made no demand for suffrage. The word was never mentioned except by the American delegates. In continental Europe the idea of demanding for woman a share in the government, is never considered. This is the more remarkable in France, as this claim was made at the time of the revolution. But every imaginable side of the question was discussed, except the side that comprehends all the others. To an American, therefore, European woman's rights is rather tame; it is like the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out. But

Digitized by Google

Europe is moving, and the next international congress will, undoubtedly, give more attention to suffrage and less to hygiene.

The Eleventh Washington Convention was held January 9, 10, 1879. The resolutions give an idea of the status of the question, and the wide range of discussion covered by the speakers: *

Resolved, That the forty-fifth congress, in ignoring the individual petitions of more than three hundred women of high social standing and culture, asking for the removal of their political disabilities, while promptly enacting special legislation for the removal of the political disabilities of every man who petitioned, furnishes an illustration of the indifference of this congress to the rights of citizens deprived of political power.

WHEREAS, Senator Blaine says, it is the very essence of tyranny to count any citizens in the basis of representation who are denied a voice in their laws and a choice in their rulers; therefore,

Resolved, That counting women in the basis of representation, while denying them the right of suffrage, is compelling them to swell the number of their tyrants and is an unwarrantable usurpation of power over one-half the citizens of this republic.

WHEREAS, In President Hayes' last message, he makes a truly paternal review of the interests of this republic, both great and small, from the army, the navy, and our foreign relations, to the ten little Indians in Hampton, Va., our timber on the western mountains, and the switches of the Washington railroads; from the Paris Exposition, the postal service, the abundant harvests, and the possible bull-dozing of some colored men in various southern districts, to cruelty to live animals, and the crowded condition of the mummies, dead ducks and fishes in the Smithsonian Institute—yet forgets to mention twenty million women robbed of their social, civil and political rights; therefore,

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed from this convention to wait upon the president and remind him of the existence of one-half of the American people whom he has accidentally overlooked, and of whom it would be wise for him to make some mention in his future messages.

WHEREAS, All of the vital principles involved in the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth constitutional amendments have been denied in their application to women by courts, legislatures and political parties; therefore,

Resolved, That it is logical that these amendments should fail to protect even the male African for whom said courts, legislatures and parties declare they were expressly designed and enacted.

Resolved, That the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States in denying Belva A. Lockwood admission to its bar, while she was entitled under the law and under its rules to that right, violated their oath of office.

Resolved, That the Senate Judiciary Committee, Mr. Edmonds chairman, in its report on the bill to allow women to practice law in the courts of the United States in which it declares that "further legislation is not necessary," evaded the plain question at issue before it in a manner unworthy of judges learned in the honorable profession of the law, and thereby sanctioned an injustice to the women of the whole country.

WHEREAS, The general government has refused to exercise federal power to protect women in their right to vote in the various States and territories; therefore,

Resolved, That it should forbear to exercise federal power to disfranchise the women of Utah, who have had a more just and liberal spirit shown them by Mormon men than Gentile women in the States have yet perceived in their rulers.

---

* Ellen Clark Sargent, California; Elizabeth Oakes Smith, North Carolina; Elizabeth Cady Stanton, New Jersey; Mrs. Devereux Blake, Mrs. Joslyn Gage, Helen M. Slocum, Helen Cooke, Susan B. Anthony, New York; Julia Brown Dunham, Iowa; Marilla M. Ricker, New Hampshire; Lavinia C. Dundore, Maryland; Robert Purvis, Julia and Rachel Foster, Pennsylvania; Emeline B. Wells, Zina Young Williams, Utah; Ellen H. Sheldon, Dr. Caroline Winslow, Sara Andrews Spencer, Belva A. Lockwood, Frederick Douglass, Julia A. Wilbur, Dr. Cora M. Bland, Washington.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R [illegible] L

Frances E. Willard

Digitized by Google

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Natural Woman Suffrage Association.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, *President.*

[illegible]

[illegible] from the territory of Utah were also received by [illegible] They called his attention to the effect of the [illegible] of the law of 1862 upon 50,000 Mormon women, [illegible] outcasts and their children nameless, asking the [illegible] executive of the nation to give some time to the considera-

[illegible]

Frances E. Willard

WHEREAS, The proposed legislation for the Chinese women on the Pacific slope and for outcast women in our cities, and the opinion of the press that no respectable woman should be seen in the streets after dark, are all based upon the presumption that woman's freedom must be forever sacrificed to man's licence; therefore,

Resolved, That the ballot in woman's hand is the only power by which she can restrain the liberty of those men who make our streets and highways dangerous to her, and secure the freedom that belongs to her by day and by night.

At the close of the convention it was decided at a meeting of the executive committee to present an address to the president and both houses of congress, and that a printed copy of the resolutions should be laid on the desk of every member. The president having granted a hearing,* the following address was presented:

To his Excellency, the President of the United States:

WHEREAS, Representatives of associations of women waited upon your excellency before the delivery of your first and second annual messages, asking that in those documents you would remember the disfranchised millions of citizens of the United States; and,

WHEREAS, Upon careful examination of those messages, we find therein specifically enumerated, the interests, great and small, of all classes of men, and recommendations of needful legislation to protect their civil and political rights, but find no mention made of any need of legislation to protect the political, civil, or social rights of one-half of the people of this republic, and,

WHEREAS, There is pending in the Senate a constitutional amendment to prohibit the several States from disfranchising United States citizens on account of sex, and a similar amendment is pending upon a tie vote in the House Judiciary Committee; and as petitions to so amend the constitution have been presented to both houses of congress from more than 40,000 well-known citizens of thirty-five States and five territories,

THEREFORE, we respectfully ask your excellency, in your next annual message, to make mention of the disfranchised millions of wives, mothers and daughters of this republic, and to recommend to congress that women equally with men be protected in the exercise of their civil and political rights.

On behalf of the National Woman Suffrage Association.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, *President.*

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Corresponding Secretary.*

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Chairman Executive Committee.*

The delegates from the territory of Utah were also received by the president. They called his attention to the effect of the enforcement of the law of 1862 upon 50,000 Mormon women, to render them outcasts and their children nameless, asking the chief executive of the nation to give some time to the considera-

* The president invited the ladies into the library, that they might be secure from interruption, and gave them throughout a most respectful and courteous hearing, asking questions and showing evident interest in the subject, and at the close promising sincere consideration of the question.

Digitized by Google

tion of the bill pending under different headings in both houses. The president asked them to set forth the facts in writing, that he might carefully weigh so important a matter. A memorial was also presented to congress by these ladies, closing thus:

We further pray that in any future legislation concerning the marriage relation in any territory under your jurisdiction you will consider the rights and the consciences of the women to be affected by such legislation, and that you will consider the permanent care and welfare of children as the sure foundation of the State.

And your petitioners will ever pray. EMMELINE B. WELLS.
ZINA YOUNG WILLIAMS.

Mr. Cannon of Utah moved that the memorial be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary with leave to report at any time. It was so referred. The Judiciary Committee of the Senate brought in a bill legitimatizing the offspring of plural marriages to a certain date; also authorizing the president to grant amnesty for past offenses against the law of 1862.

The *Congressional Record* of January 24, under the head of petitions and memorials, said:

The vice-president, Mr. Wheeler of New York, presented the petition of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Matilda Joslyn Gage and Susan B. Anthony, officers of the National Association, praying for the passage of Senate joint resolution No. 12, providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, protecting the rights of women, and also that the House Judiciary Committee be relieved from the further consideration of a similar resolution.

Mr. FERRY—If there be no objection I ask that the petition be read at length.

The VICE-PRESIDENT—The Chair hears no objection, and it will be reported by the secretary.

The petition was read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

WHEREAS, More than 40,000 men and women, citizens of thirty-five States and five territories, have petitioned the forty-fifth congress asking for an amendment to the federal constitution prohibiting the several States from disfranchising United States citizens on account of sex; and

WHEREAS, A resolution providing for such constitutional amendment is upon the calendar (Senate resolution No. 12, second session forty-fifth congress), and a similar resolution is pending upon a tie vote in the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives; and

WHEREAS, The women of the United States constitute one-half of the people of this republic and have an inalienable right to an equal voice with men in the nation's councils; and

WHEREAS, Women being denied the right to have their opinions counted at the ballot-box, are compelled to hold all other rights subject to the favors and caprices of men; and

Digitized by Google

WHEREAS, In answer to the appeals of so large a number of honorable petitioners, it is courteous that the forty-fifth congress should express its opinion upon this grave question of human rights; therefore,

We pray your honorable body to take from the calendar and pass Senate resolution No. 12, providing for an amendment to the constitution protecting the rights of women; and

We further pray you to relieve the House Judiciary Committee from the further consideration of the woman suffrage resolution brought to a tie vote in that committee, February 5, 1878, that it may be submitted to the House of Representatives for immediate action.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, *President.*

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Corresponding Secretary.*

SUSAN B. ANTHONY, *Chairman Executive Committee.*

At the opening of the last session of the forty-fifth congress most earnest appeals (copies of which were sent to every member of congress) came from all directions for the presentation of a minority report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections The response from our representatives was prompt and most encouraging. The first favorable report our question had ever received in the Senate of the United States was presented by the Hon. George F. Hoar, February 1, 1879:

The undersigned, a minority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom were referred the resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution prohibiting discrimination in the right of suffrage on account of sex, and certain petitions in aid of the same, submit the following minority report:

The undersigned dissent from the report of the majority of the committee. The demand for the extension of the right of suffrage to women is not new. It has been supported by many persons in this country, in England and on the continent, famous in public life, in literature and in philosophy. But no single argument of its advocates seems to us to carry so great a persuasive force as the difficulty which its ablest opponents encounter in making a plausible statement of their objections. We trust we do not fail in deference to our esteemed associates on the committee when we avow our opinion that their report is no exception to this rule.

The people of the United States and of the several States have founded their political institutions upon the principle that all men have an equal right to a share in the government. The doctrine is expressed in various forms. The Declaration of Independence asserts that "all men are created equal" and that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." The Virginia bill of rights, the work of Jefferson and George Mason, affirms that "no man or set of men are entitled to exclusive or separate emoluments or privileges from the rest of the community but in consideration of public services." The Massachusetts bill of rights, the work of John Adams, besides reaffirming these axioms, declares that "all the inhabitants of this commonwealth, having such

Digitized by Google

qualifications as they shall establish by their frame of government, have an equal right to elect officers, and to be elected for public employment." These principles, after full and profound discussion by a generation of statesmen whose authority upon these subjects is greater than that of any other that ever lived, have been accepted by substantially the whole American people as the dictates alike of practical wisdom and of natural justice. The experience of a hundred years has strengthened their hold upon the popular conviction. Our fathers failed in three particulars to carry these principles to their logical result. They required a property qualification for the right to vote and to hold office. They kept the negro in slavery. They excluded women from a share in the government. The first two of these inconsistencies have been remedied. The property test no longer exists. The fifteenth amendment provides that race, color, or previous servitude shall no longer be a disqualification. There are certain qualifications of age, of residence, and, in some instances of education, demanded; but these are such as all sane men may easily attain.

This report is not the place to discuss or vindicate the correctness of this theory. In so far as the opponents of woman suffrage are driven to deny it, for the purpose of an argument addressed to the American people, they are driven to confess that they are in the wrong. This people are committed to the doctrine of universal suffrage by their constitutions, their history and their opinions. They must stand by it or fall by it. The poorest, humblest, feeblest of sane men has the ballot in his hand, and no other man can show a better title to it. Those things wherein men are unequal—intelligence, ability, integrity, experience, title to public confidence by reason of previous public service—have their natural and legitimate influence under a government wherein each man's vote is counted, to quite as great a degree as under any other form of government that ever existed.

We believe that the principle of universal suffrage stands to-day stronger than ever in the judgment of mankind. Some eminent and accomplished scholars, alarmed by the corruption and recklessness manifested in our great cities, deceived by exaggerated representations of the misgovernment of the Southern States by a race just emerging from slavery, disgusted by the extent to which great numbers of our fellow-citizens have gone astray in the metaphysical subtleties of financial discussion, have uttered their eloquent warnings of the danger of the failure of universal suffrage. Such utterances from such sources have been frequent. They were never more abundant than in the early part of the present century. They are, when made in a serious and patriotic spirit, to be received with the gratitude due to that greatest of public benefactors --he who points out to the people their dangers and their faults.

But popular suffrage is to be tried not by comparison with ideal standards of excellence, but by comparison with other forms of government. We are willing to submit our century of it to this test. The crimes that have stained our history have come chiefly from its denial, not from its establishment. The misgovernment and corruption of our great cities have been largely due to men whose birth and training have been under

Digitized by Google

other systems. The abuses attributed by political hostility to negro governments at the South—governments from which the intelligence and education of the State held themselves sulkily aloof—do not equal those which existed under the English or French aristocracy within the memory of living men. There have been crimes, blunders, corruptions, follies in the history of our republic. Aristides has been banished from public employment, while Cleon has been followed by admiring throngs. But few of these things have been due to the extension of the suffrage. Strike out of our history the crimes of slavery, strike out the crimes, unparalleled for ferocity and brutality, committed by an oligarchy in its attempt to overthrow universal suffrage, and we may safely challenge for our national and State governments comparison with monarchy or aristocracy in their best and purest periods.

Either the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence and the bills of rights are true, or government must rest on no principle of right whatever, but its powers may be lawfully taken by force and held by force by any person or class who have strength to do it, and who persuade themselves that their rule is for the public interest. Either these doctrines are true, or you can give no reason for your own possession of the suffrage except that you have got it. If this doctrine be sound, it follows that no class of persons can rightfully be excluded from their equal share in the government, unless they can be proved to lack some quality essential to the proper exercise of political power.

A person who votes helps, first, to determine the measures of government; second, to elect persons to be intrusted with public administration. He should therefore possess, first, an honest desire for the public welfare; second, sufficient intelligence to determine what measure or policy is best; third, the capacity to judge of the character of persons proposed for office; and, fourth, freedom from undue influence, so that the vote he casts is his own, and not another's. That person or class casting his or their own vote, with an honest desire for the public welfare, and with sufficient intelligence to judge what measure is advisable and what person may be trusted, fulfill every condition that the State can rightfully impose.

We are not now dealing with the considerations which should affect the admission of citizens of other countries to acquire the right to take part in our government. All nations claim the right to impose restrictions on the admission of foreigners trained in attachment to other countries or forms of rule, and to indifference to their own, whatever they deem the safety of the State requires. We take it for granted that no person will deny that the women of America are inspired with a love of country equal to that which animates their brothers and sons. A capacity to judge of character, so sure and rapid as to be termed intuitive, is an especial attribute of woman. One of the greatest orators of modern times has declared:

> I concede away nothing which I ought to assert for our sex when I say that the collective womanhood of a people like our own seizes with matchless facility and certainty on the moral and personal peculiarities and character of marked and conspicuous men, and that we may very wisely address ourselves to such a body to learn if a

Digitized by Google

competitor for the highest honors has revealed that truly noble nature that entitled him to a place in the hearts of a nation.

We believe that in that determining of public policies by the collective judgment of the State which constitutes self-government, the contribution of woman will be of great importance and value. To all questions into the determination of which considerations of justice or injustice enter, she will bring a more refined moral sense than that of man. The most important public function of the State is the provision for the education of youths. In those States in which the public school system has reached its highest excellence, more than ninety per cent. of the teachers are women. Certainly the vote of the women of the State should be counted in determining the policy that shall regulate the school system which they are called to administer.

It is seldom that particular measures of government are decided by direct popular vote. They are more often discussed before the people after they have taken effect, when the party responsible for them is called to account. The great measures which go to make up the history of nations are determined not by the voters, but by their rulers, whether those rulers be hereditary or elected. The plans of great campaigns are conceived by men of great military genius and executed by great generals. Great systems of finance come from the brain of statesmen who have made finance a special study. The mass of the voters decide to which party they will intrust power. They do not determine particulars. But they give to parties their general tone and direction, and hold them to their accountability. We believe that woman will give to the political parties of the country a moral temperament which will have a most beneficent and ennobling effect on politics.

Woman, also, is specially fitted for the performance of that function of legislative and executive government which, with the growth of civilization, becomes yearly more and more important—the wise and practical economic adjustment of the details of public expenditures. It may be considered that it would not be for the public interest to clothe with the suffrage any class of persons who are so dependent that they will, as a general rule, be governed by others in its exercise. But we do not admit that this is true of women. We see no reason to believe that women will not be as likely to retain their independence of political judgment, as they now retain their independence of opinion in regard to the questions which divide religious sects from one another. These questions deeply excite the feelings of mankind, yet experience shows that the influence of the wife is at least as great as that of the husband in determining the religious opinion of the household. The natural influence exerted by members of the same family upon each other would doubtless operate to bring about similarity of opinion on political questions as on others. So far as this tends to increase the influence of the family in the State, as compared with that of unmarried men, we deem it an advantage. Upon all questions which touch public morals, public education, all which concern the interest of the household, such a united exertion of political influence cannot be otherwise than beneficial.

Digitized by Google

Our conclusion, then, is that the American people must extend the right of suffrage to woman or abandon the idea that suffrage is a birthright. The claim that universal suffrage will work mischief in practice is simply a claim that justice will work mischief in practice. Many honest and excellent persons, while admitting the force of the arguments above stated, fear that taking part in politics will destroy those feminine traits which are the charm of woman, and are the chief comfort and delight of the household. If we thought so we should agree with the majority of the committee in withholding assent to the prayer of the petitioners. This fear is the result of treating the abuses of the political function as essential to its exercise. The study of political questions, the forming an estimate of the character of public men or public measures, the casting a vote, which is the result of that study and estimate, certainly have in themselves nothing to degrade the most delicate and refined nature. The violence, the fraud, the crime, the chicanery, which, so far as they have attended masculine struggles for political power, tend to prove, if they prove anything, the unfitness of men for the suffrage, are not the result of the act of voting, but are the expressions of course, criminal and evil natures, excited by the desire for victory. The admission to the polls of delicate and tender women would, without injury to them, tend to refine and elevate the politics in which they took a part. When, in former times, women were excluded from social banquets, such assemblies were scenes of ribaldry and excess. The presence of women has substituted for them the festival of the Christian home.

The majority of the committee state the following as their reasons for the conclusion to which they come:

First—If the petitioners' prayer be granted it will make several millions of female voters.

Second—These voters will be inexperienced in public affairs.

Third—They are quite generally dependent on the other sex.

Fourth—They are incapable of military duty.

Fifth—They are without the power to enforce the laws which their numerical strength may enable them to make.

Sixth—Very few of them wish to assume the irksome and responsible duties which this measure thrusts upon them.

Seventh—Such a change should only be made slowly and in obedience to a general public demand.

Eighth—There are but thirty thousand petitioners.

Ninth—It would be unjust to impose "the heavy burden of governing, which so many men seek to evade, on the great mass of women who do not wish for it, to gratify the few who do."

Tenth—Women now have the sympathy of judges and juries "to an extent which would warrant loud complaint on the part of their adversaries of the sterner sex."

Eleventh—Such a change should be made, if at all, by the States. Three-fourths of the States should not force it on the others. In any State in which "any considerable part of the women wish for the right to vote, it will be granted without the intervention of congress."

The first objection of the committee is to the large increase of the number of the voting population. We believe on the other hand, that to double the numbers of the constituent body, and to compose one-half

Digitized by Google

that body of women, would tend to elevate the standard of the representative both for ability and manly character. Macaulay in one of his speeches on the Reform bill refers to the quality of the men who had for half a century been members for the five most numerous constituencies in England—Westminster, Southwark, Liverpool, Bristol and Norwich. Among them were Burke, Fox, Sheridan, Romilly, Windham, Tierney, Canning, Huskisson. Eight of the nine greatest men who had sat in parliament for forty years sat for the five largest represented towns. To increase the numbers of constituencies diminishes the opportunity for corruption. Size is itself a conservative force in a republic. As a permanent general rule the people will desire their own best interest. Disturbing forces, evil and selfish passions, personal ambitions, are neccessarily restricted in their operation. The larger the field of operation, the more likely are such influences to neutralize each other.

The objection of inexperience in public affairs applies, of course, alike to every voter when he first votes. If it be valid, it would have prevented any extension of the suffrage, and would exclude from the franchise a very large number of masculine voters of all ages.

That women are quite generally dependent on the other sex is true. So it is true that men are quite generally dependent on the other sex. It is impossible so to measure this dependence as to declare that man is more dependent on woman or woman upon man. It is by no means true that the dependence of either on the other affects the right to the suffrage.

Capacity for military duty has no connection with capacity for suffrage. The former is wholly physical. It will scarcely be proposed to disfranchise men who are unfit to be soldiers by reason of age or bodily infirmity. The suggestion that the country may be plunged into wars by a majority of women who are secure from military dangers is not founded in experience. Men of the military profession, and men of the military age are commonly quite as eager for war as non-combatants, and will hereafter be quite as indifferent to its risks and hardships as their mothers and wives.

The argument that women are without the power to enforce the laws which their numerical strength may enable them to make, proceeds from the supposition that it is probable that all the women will range themselves upon one side in politics and all the men on the other. Such supposition flatly contradicts the other arguments drawn from the dependence of women and from their alleged unwillingness to assume political burdens. So men over fifty years of age are without the power to enforce obedience to laws against which the remainder of the voters forcibly rebel. It is not physical power alone, but power aided by the respect for law of the people, on which laws depend for their enforcement.

The sixth, eighth and ninth reasons of the committee are the same proposition differently stated. It is that a share in the government of the country is a burden, and one which, in the judgment of a majority of the women of the country, they ought not to be required to assume. If any citizen deem the exercise of this franchise a burden and not a privilege, such person is under no constraint to exercise it. But if it be a birthright, then it is obvious that no other power than that of the indi-

Digitized by Google

vidual concerned can rightfully restrain its exercise. The committee concede that women ought to be clothed with the ballot in any State where any considerable part of the women desire it. This is a pretty serious confession. On the vital, fundamental question whether the institutions of this country shall be so far changed that the number of persons in it who take a part in the government shall be doubled, the judgment of women is to be and ought to be decisive. If woman may fitly determine this question, for what question of public policy is she unfit? What question of equal importance will ever be submitted to her decision? What has become of the argument that women are unfit to vote because they are dependent on men, or because they are unfit for military duty, or because they are inexperienced, or because they are without power to enforce obedience to their laws?

The next argument is that by the present arrangement the administration of justice is so far perverted that one-half the citizens of the country have an advantage from the sympathies of juries and judges which "would warrant loud complaint" on the part of the other half. If this be true, it is doubtless due to an instinctive feeling on the part of juries and judges that existing laws and institutions are unjust to women, or to the fact that juries composed wholly of men are led to do injustice by their susceptibility to the attractions of women. But certainly it is a grave defect in any system of government that it does not administer justice impartially, and the existence of such a defect is a strong reason for preferring an arrangement which would remove the feeling that women do not have fair play, or for so composing juries that, drawn from both sexes, they would be impartial between the two.

The final objection of the committee is that "such a change should be made, if at all, by the States. Three-fourths of the States should not force it upon the others. Whenever any considerable part of the women in any State wish for the right to vote, it will be granted without the intervention of congress." Who can doubt that when two-thirds of congress and three-fourths of the States have voted for the change, a considerable number of women in the other States will be found to desire it, so that, according to the committee's own belief, it can never be forced by a majority on unwilling communities? The prevention of unjust discrimination by States against large classes of people in respect to suffrage is even admitted to be a matter of national concern and an important function of the national constitution and laws. It is the duty of congress to propose amendments to the constitution whenever two-thirds of both houses deem them necessary. Certainly an amendment will be deemed necessary, if it can be shown to be required by the principles on which the constitution is based, and to remove an unjust disfranchisement from one-half the citizens of the country. The constitutional evidence of general public demand is to be found not in petitions, but in the assent of three-fourths of the States through their legislatures or conventions.

The lessons of experience favor the conclusion that woman is fit for a share in government. It may be true that in certain departments of intellectual effort the greatest achievements of women have as yet never

Digitized by Google

equaled the greatest achievements of men. But it is equally true that in those same departments women have exhibited an intellectual ability very far beyond that of the average of men and very far beyond that of most men who have shown very great political capacity. But let the comparison be made in regard to the very thing with which we have to deal. Of men who have swayed chief executive power, a very considerable proportion have attained it by usurpation or by election, processes which imply extraordinary capacity on their part as compared with other men. The women who have held such power have come to it as sovereigns by inheritance, or as regents by the accident of bearing a particular relation to the lawful sovereign when he was under some incapacity. Yet it is an undisputed fact that the number of able and successful female sovereigns bears a vastly greater proportion to the whole number of such sovereigns, than does the number of able and successful male sovereigns to the whole number of men who have reigned. An able, energetic, virtuous king or emperor is the exception and not the rule in the history of modern Europe. With hardly an exception the female sovereigns or regents have been wise and popular. Mr. Mill, who makes this point, says:

> We know how small a number of reigning queens history presents in comparison with that of kings. Of this small number a far larger proportion have shown talents for rule, though many of them have occupied the throne in difficult periods. When to queens and empresses we add regents and viceroys of provinces, the list of women who have been eminent rulers of mankind swells to a great length. . . . . Especially is this true if we take into consideration Asia as well as Europe. If a Hindoo principality is strongly, vigilantly and economically governed; if order is preserved without oppression; if cultivation is extending and the people prosperous, in three cases out of four that principality is under a woman's rule. This fact, to me an entirely unexpected one, I have collected from a long official knowledge of Hindoo governments.

Certainly history gives no warning that should deter the American people from carrying out the principles upon which their government rests to this most just and legitimate conclusion. Those persons who think that free government has anywhere failed, can only claim that this tends to prove, not the failure of universal suffrage, but the failure of masculine suffrage. Like failure has attended the operation of every other great human institution, the family, the school, the church, whenever woman has not been permitted to contribute to it her full share. As to the best example of the perfect family, the perfect school, the perfect church, the love, the purity, the truth of woman are essential, so they are equally essential to the perfect example of the self-governing State.

GEO. F. HOAR,
JOHN H. MITCHELL,
ANGUS CAMERON.

Thousands of copies of this report were published and franked to every part of the country. On February 7, just one week after the presentation of the able minority report, the bill allowing women to practice before the Supreme Court passed the Senate *

* At its final action, the bill was called up by Hon. J. E. McDonald of Indiana. After some discussion it was passed without amendment—40 to 20. *Yeas*—Allison, Anthony, Barnum, Beck, Blaine,

Digitized by Google

and received the signature of President Hayes. Senators McDonald, Hoar and Sargent made the principal speeches. We give Mr. Hoar's speech in full because of its terse and vigorous presentation of the fact that congress is a body superior to the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Hoar said:

Mr. President—I understand the brief statement which was made, I think, during this last session by the majority of the Judiciary Committee in support of their opposition to this bill, did not disclose that the majority of that committee were opposed to permitting women to engage in the practice of law or to be admitted to practice it in the Supreme Court of the United States, but the point they made, was that the legislation of the United States left to the Supreme Court the power of determining by rule who should be admitted to practice before that tribunal, and that we ought not by legislation to undertake to interfere with its rules. Now, with the greatest respect for that tribunal, I conceive that the law-making and not the law-expounding power in this government ought to determine the question what class of citizens shall be clothed with the office of the advocate. I believe that leaving to the Supreme Court by rule to determine the qualifications or disqualifications of attorneys and counselors in that court is an exception to the nearly uniform policy of the States of the Union. Would it be tolerated if the Supreme Court undertook by rule to establish any other disqualification, any of those disqualifications which have existed in regard to holding any other office in the country? Suppose the court were of the opinion we had been too fast in relieving persons who took part in the late rebellion from their disabilities, and that it would not admit persons who had so taken part to practice before the Supreme Court; is there any doubt that congress would at once interfere? Suppose the Supreme Court were of opinion that the people of the United States had erred in the amendment which had removed the disqualification from colored persons and declined to admit such persons to practice in that court; is there any doubt that congress would interfere and would deem it a fit occasion for the exercise of the law-making power?

Now, Mr. President, this bill is not a bill merely to admit women to the privilege of engaging in a particular profession; it is a bill to secure to the citizen of the United States the right to select his counsel, and that is all. At present a case is tried and decided in the State courts of any State of this Union which may be removed to the Supreme Court of the United States. In the courts of the State, women are permitted to practice as advocates, and a woman has been the advocate under whose direction and care and advocacy the case has been won in the court below. Is it tolerable that the counsel who has attended the case from its commencement to its successful termination in the highest court of the State

---

Booth, Burnside, Cameron (Pennsylvania), Cameron (Wisconsin), Dawes, Dorsey, Ferry, Garland, Gordon, Hamlin, Hoar, Howe, Ingalls, Jones (Florida), Jones (Nevada), Kellogg, Kirkwood, McCreery, McDonald, McMillan, McPherson, Matthews, Mitchell, Oglesby, Ransom, Rollins, Sargent, Teller, Voorhees, Wadleigh, Windom, Withers. *Nays*—Baily, Chaffee, Coke, Davis (Illinois), Davis (West Virginia), Eaton, Edmunds, Eustis, Grover, Harris, Hereford, Hill, Kernan, Maxey, Merrimon, Morgan, Randolph, Saulsbury, Wallace, White.

Digitized by Google

should not be permitted to attend upon and defend the rights of that client when the case is transferred to the Supreme Court of the United States? Everybody knows, at least every lawyer of experience knows, the impossibility of transferring with justice to the interests of a client, a cause from one counsel to another. A suit is instituted under the advice of a counsel on a certain theory, a certain remedy is selected, a certain theory of the cause is the one on which it is staked. Now that must be attended to and defended by the counsel under whose advice the suit has taken its shape; the pleadings have been shaped in the courts below.

Under the present system, a citizen of any State in the Union having selected a counsel of good moral character who has practiced three years, who possesses all-sufficient professional and personal qualifications, and having had a cause brought to a successful result in the State court, is denied by the present existing and unjust rule having counsel of his choice argue the cause in the Supreme Court of the United States.

The greatest master of human manners, who read the human heart and who understood better than any man who ever lived the varieties of human character, when he desired to solve just what had puzzled the lawyers and doctors, placed a woman upon the judgment seat; and yet, under the present existing law, if Portia herself were alive, she could not defend the opinion she had given, before the Supreme Court of the United States.

The press commented favorably upon this new point gained for women. We give a few extracts:

The senators who voted to-day against the bill "to relieve certain legal disabilities of women" are marked men and have reason to fear the result of their action.—[Telegraph to the New York *Tribune*, February 7.

The women get into the Supreme Court in spite of the determination of the justices. They gained a decided advantage to-day in the passage by the Senate of a bill providing that any woman who shall have been a member of the highest court in any State or territory, or of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, for three years, may be admitted to the Supreme Court. The bill was called up by Senator McDonald, in antagonism to Mr. Edmunds' amendment to the constitution which was the pending order. Mr. Edmunds objected to the consideration of the bill and voted against it. There was not much discussion, the main speeches being by Mr. Sargent and Mr. Hoar.—[Special dispatch to the New York *World*, February 7.

A Woman's Rights Victory in the Senate.—The Lockwood bill, giving women authority to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States, passed the Senate yesterday by a vote of two to one, and now it only requires the approval of Mr. Hayes to become a law. The powerful effect of persistent and industrious lobbying is manifested in the success of this bill. When it was first introduced, it is doubtful if one-fourth the members of congress would have voted for it. Some of the strong-minded women, who were interested in the bill, stuck to it, held the fort from day to day, and talked members and senators into believing it a just measure. Senator McDonald gave Mr. Edmunds a rebuff yesterday that he will not soon forget. The latter attempted to administer a rebuke to the Indiana senator for calling up a bill during the absence of the senator who had reported it. Mr. McDonald retorted that he knew the objection of the senator from Vermont was made for the purpose of defeating the bill and not, as pretended, to give an absent senator opportunity to speak upon it.—[Washington *Post*, February 8.

Digitized by Google

The credit for this victory belongs to Mrs. Belva Lockwood, of this city, who, having been refused admission to the bar of the United States Supreme Court, appealed to congress, and by dint of hard work has finally succeeded in having her bill passed by both houses. She called on Mrs. Hayes last evening, who complimented her upon her achievement, and informed her that she had sent a bouquet to Senator Hoar, in token of his efforts in behalf of the bill.—[Washington *Star*, February 8.

The bill was carried through merely by the energetic advocacy of Senators McDonald, Sargent and Hoar, whose oratorical efforts were reënforced by the presence of Mrs. Lockwood. After the struggle was over, all the senators who advocated the bill were made the recipients of bouquets, while the three senators whose names we have given received large baskets of flowers. This is a pleasing omen of that purification of legal business which it is hoped will flow from the introduction of women to the courts. It was not flowers that used to be distributed at Washington and Albany in the old corrupt times, among legislators, in testimony of gratitude for their votes. Let us hope that venal legislation at Washington will be extirpated by the rise of this beautiful custom.—[New York *Nation*.

It was noticeable that all the presidential candidates dodged the issue except Senator Blaine, who voted for the bill.—[Chicago *Inter-Ocean*.

How humiliated poor old Judge Magruder must feel, since the congress of the United States paid the woman whom he forbade to open her mouth in his august presence, in his little court, so much consideration as to pass an act opening to her the doors of the Supreme Court of the United States. All honor to the brave woman, who by her own unaided efforts thus achieved honor, fortune and fame—the just rewards of her own true worth.—[*Havre Republican*, Havre de Grace, Maryland.

ENTER PORTIA.—An act of congress was not necessary to authorize women to be lawyers, if their legal acquirements fitted them for that vocation; nor was it necessary to state, as an expression of opinion by the national legislature, that some women are so fully qualified for the legal profession that no barriers should be permitted to stand in their way. It was needed simply as a key whereby the hitherto locked door of the Supreme Court of the United States may he opened if a woman lawyer, with the usual credentials, should knock thereon. That is all; and there is no new question opened for profitless debate. The ability of some women to be lawyers is like the ability of others to make bread—it rests upon the facts. There is no room for elaborate argument to prove either their fitness or unfitness for legal studies, so long as in Missouri, Wisconsin, Michigan, the District of Columbia, Iowa and North Carolina there are women in more or less successful practice and repute. * * * Nowhere are these great attributes of civilization and regulated liberty—law, conservatism, justice, equity and mercy in the administration of human affairs put in broader light or truer, than they are by the words that Shakespeare puts in the mouth of this woman jurist.—[*Public Ledger*, Philadelphia, February 12.

When congress recently passed a law allowing women to practice in the Supreme Court, it was not a subject of any special or eager comment. A woman who is a lawyer sent flowers to the desks of the members who voted for the bill, and before they had faded, comment was at an end. The home was still safe and the country was not in peril. It was one of the questions which had settled itself and was a foregone conclusion. * * * United States Senator Edmunds of Vermont, has fallen into disfavor with the ladies for voting against the above bill.—[From John W. Forney's *Progress*, February 22.

On March 3, by motion of Hon. A. G. Riddle, Mrs. Lockwood was admitted to the bar of the United States Supreme Court,*

* Conspicuous in the large and distinguished audience present were Senator M'Donald, Attorney-general Williams, Hon. Jeremiah Wilson, Judge Shellabarger, Hon. George W. Julian, who with many others extended hearty congratulations to Mrs. Lockwood.

Digitized by Google

taking the official oath and receiving the classic sheep-skin; and the following week she was admitted to practice before the Court of Claims. The forty-sixth congress contained an unusually large proportion of new representatives, fresh from the people, ready for the discussion of new issues, and manifesting a chivalric spirit toward the consideration of woman's claims as a citizen. On Tuesday, April 29, the following resolution was submitted to the Committee on Rules in the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That a select committee of nine members be appointed by the speaker, to be called a Committee on the Rights of Women, whose duty it shall be to consider and report upon all petitions, memorials, resolutions and bills that may be presented in the House relating to the rights of women.

Admitting the justice of a fair consideration of a question involving every human right of one-half of the population of this country, Alex. H. Stephens of Georgia, James A. Garfield of Ohio, Wm. P. Frye of Maine, immediately declared themselves in favor of the appointment of said committee, and Speaker Randall, the chairman, ordered it reported to the House. A similar resolution was introduced in the Senate, before the adjournment of the special session. This showed a clearer perception of the magnitude of the question, and the need of its early and earnest consideration, than at any time during the previous thirty years of argument, heroic struggle and sacrifice on the altar of woman's freedom.

The anniversary of 1879 was held in St. Louis, Missouri, May 7, 8, 9. Mrs. Virginia L. Minor and Miss Phœbe W. Couzins made all possible arrangements for the success of the meeting and the comfort of the delegates.* Mrs. Minor briefly stated the object of the convention and announced that, as the president of the association had not arrived, Mrs. Joslyn Gage would take the chair. Miss Couzins gave the address of welcome:

Mrs. President and Members of the National Woman Suffrage Association:

It becomes my pleasant duty to welcome you to the hospitalities of my native city. To extend to you who for the first time meet beyond the Mississippi, a greeting—not only in behalf of the friends of woman suffrage, but

* *Washington, D. C.*—Sara A. Spencer. *Illinois*—Clara Lyon Peters, Watseka; Mrs. G. P. Graham, Martha L. Mathews, Amanda E. and Matilda S. Frazer, Aledo; Hannah J. Coffee, Abby B. Trego, Orion; Mrs. Senator Hanna, Fairfield; Sarah F. Nourse, Moline; Mrs. E. P. Reynolds, Rock Island; Cynthia Leonard, Chicago. *Missouri*—Virginia L. Minor, Mrs. M. A. Peoquine, Mrs. P. W. Thomas, Eliza J. Patrick, Mrs. E. M. Dan, Eliza A. Robbins Phœbe W. Couzins, Alex. Robbins, St. Louis; James L. Allen, Oregon; Miss A. J. Sparks, Warrensburg. *Wisconsin*—Rev. Olympia Brown, Racine. *New York*—Susan B. Anthony Matilda Joslyn Gage, Mary R. Pell, Florence Pell. *Indiana.*—Helen Austin, Richmond; May Wright Thompson, Amy E. Dunn, Gertrude Garrison, Mary E. Haggart, Indianapolis. *Tennessee*—Elizabeth Avery Meriwether, Minor Lee Meriwether, Memphis. *Kentucky*—Mary B. Clay, Richmond. *Louisiana*—Emily P. Collins, Ponchatoula. *Ohio*—Eva L. Pinney, South Newbury. *Pennsylvania*—Mrs. L. P. Danforth, Julia and Rachel Foster, Philadelphia.

Digitized by Google

for those of our citizens who, while not in full sympathy with your views, have a desire to hear you in deliberative council and to cordially tender you the same courtesies offered other conventions which have chosen St. Louis as their place of annual gathering.

And I am the more happy to do this because of the opportunity it affords me to disabuse your minds of certain impressions which have gone abroad concerning our slowness of action in the line of advanced ideas. Certainly in some phases of that reformation to which you and your co-laborers have pledged your lives, your fortunes—the cause of woman—St. Louis is the leader.

When, eighteen or twenty years since, Harriet Hosmer desired to study anatomy, to perfect herself in her art, not a college in New England would open its doors to her; she traveled West, and through the generous patronage of Wayman Crow of this city, she became a pupil of the dean of the St. Louis Medical college.

When other cities had refused equality of wages and position, St. Louis placed Miss Brackett at the head of our normal school, giving her—a heretofore exclusively male prerogative—the highest wages, added to the highest educational rank.

And here in St. Louis began the advance march which has finally broken down the walls of the highest judicial fortress, the Supreme Court of the United States. Washington University, in response to my request, unhesitatingly opened its doors, and for the first time in the history of America, woman was accorded the right to a legal course of training with man, and, at its close, after successful examination, I was freely accorded the degree of Bachelor of Laws! A city or a State that could perpetrate the anomaly of a female bachelor, is certainly not far behind the radicalism of the age.

Again, as I turn to its record on suffrage, I find as early as 1866 the Hon. B. Gratz Brown of Missouri made a glowing speech for woman's enfranchisement, in the United States Senate, on Mr. Cowan's motion to strike out "male" from the District of Columbia suffrage bill, which resulted in an organization in 1867, through the efforts of Mrs. Virginia L. Minor, its first president. And again, I remember when that hydra-headed evil arose in our midst, degrading all women and violating all the sweet and sacred sanctities of life—a blow at our homes and a lasting stigma on our civilization—the people of this community, led by the chancellor of Washington Universiy, at the ballot-box but recently laid that monster away in a tomb, never, I trust, to be resurrected.

And now, Mrs. President, let me add, in words which but faintly express the emotion of my heart, the gratitude we feel towards the noble women who have borne the burden and heat of the day. They who have been ridiculed, villified, maligned, but through it all maintained an unswerving allegiance to truth. In the name of all true womanhood I welcome this association in our midst as worthy of the highest honor.

We have lived to see the enlargement of woman's thought in all directions. From our laboratories, libraries, observatories, schools of medicine and law, universities of science, art and literature, she is advancing to the

Digitized by Google

examination of the problems of life, with an eye single only to the glory of truth. Like the Spartan of old she has thrown her spear into the thickest of the fray, and will fight gloriously in the midst thereof till she regains her own. No specious sophistry or vain delusion—no time-honored tradition or untenable doctrine can evade her searching investigation.

Mrs. Gage responded to this address in a few earnest, appropriate words.

Of the many letters * read in the convention none was received with greater joy than the few lines, written with trembling hand, from Lucretia Mott, then in the eighty-seventh year of her age:

ROADSIDE, Fourth Month, 26, 1879.

MY DEAR SUSAN ANTHONY—It would need no urgent appeal to draw me to St. Louis had I the strength for the journey. You will have no need of my worn-out powers. Our cause itself has become sufficiently attractive. Edward M. Davis has a joint letter on hand for my signature, so this is enough, with my mite toward expenses. And to all assembled in St. Louis best wishes for—yes, full faith in your success. I have signed Edward's letter, so it is hardly necessary for me to say,

LUCRETIA MOTT.

The distinguishing feature of this convention was an afternoon session of ladies alone, prompted by an attempt to reënact a law for the license of prostitution, which had been enforced in St. Louis a few years before and repealed through the united efforts of the best men and women of the city. Mrs. Joslyn Gage opened the meeting by reading extracts from the Woman's Declaration of Rights presented at the centennial celebration, and drew especial attention to the clause referring to two separate codes of morals for men and women, arising from woman's inferior political position:

There are two points which may be considered open for discussion during the afternoon—one, the fact that there are existing in all forms of society, barbaric, semi-civilized, civilized or enlightened, two separate

* Letters sympathizing with the purposes of the convention were received from Lucretia Mott, Pa.; Clarina I. H. Nichols, Cal.; Lucinda B. Chandler, N, J.; Annie Laura Quinby, Ky.; Mrs. N. R. Allen, Ia.; Isabella B. Hooker, Ct.; Emeline B. Wells, Utah; Sarah Burger Stearns, Minn.; Mary A. Livermore, Mass.; Elizabeth Oakes Smith, N. Y.; Hannah Tracy Cutler, M. D., Ill.; Mrs. S. F. Proebstell, Ore.; Mrs. C. C. Knowles, R. I.; Dr. Clemence S. Lozier, Lillie Devereux Blake, N. Y. (with a fable, "Nothing New"); Lavinia Goodell, Wis.; Elizabeth H. Duvall, Ky.; Alida C. Avery, M. D., Col.; Hattie M. Crumb, Mo.; Mrs. J. H. Pattee, Ill.; Caroline B. Winslow, M. D., Washington; Miss Kate Trimble, Ky.; Mrs. M. M'Clellan Brown, Pa.; Alice Black, Mo.; Margaret M. Baker, Mo.; Mrs. Elsie Stewart, Kan.; Edward M. Davis, Pa.; Mrs. Scott Saxton, Louisville; Kate Gannett Wells, Boston; Anna R. Irvine, Mo.; Sarah M. Kimball, Salt Lake; Lelia E. Partridge, Pa.; Ellen H. Sheldon, D. C.; Rev. W. C. Gannett, Minn.; Elizabeth L. Saxon, New Orleans; Mrs. J. Swain, Ill.; Geo. M. Jackson, John Finn, A Practical Woman, St. Louis; Maria Harkner, Mrs. J. Martin, Kate B. Ross, Ill.; Emma Molloy, Ind.; Maria J. Johnston, Mo.; Zenas Brockett, N. Y.; Kate N. Doggett, president of the Association for the Advancement of Women; Rebecca N. Hazard, president of the American Woman Suffrage Society; Madam Anneke, for the Wisconsin Suffrage Association; The Hutchinson Family ("Tribe of John"); South Newbury Ohio Woman Suffrage Society. Foreign letters were also received from Jessie Morrison Wellstood, Edinburgh; Lydia E. Becker, Manchester, England, editor *Woman's Suffrage Journal.*

Digitized by Google

codes of morals; the strict code to which women are held accountable, and the lax code which governs the conduct of men.

The other question which can very properly be discussed at the present time is, "Why in this country, and in all civilized nations, do one-half of the population die under five years of age, and in some countries a very large proportion under one year?"

A letter was read from Mrs. Josephine E. Butler. As the experiment of licensing prostitution had been extensively tried in England, and she had watched the effects of the system not only in her own country but on the continent, her opinions on this question are worthy of consideration:

To the Annual Meeting of the National Suffrage Association in St. Louis:

DEAR FRIENDS—As I am unable to be present at your convention on May 7, 8, 9, and as you ask for a communication from me, I gladly write you on some of the later phases of our struggle against legalized prostitution. A brave battle has been fought in St. Louis against that iniquity, and we have regarded it with sympathy and admiration; but you are not yet safe against the devices of those who uphold this white slavery, nor are we safe, although we know that in the end we shall be conquerors. You tell me that "England is held up as an example of the beneficial working of the legalizing of vice." England holds a peculiar position in regard to the question. She was the last to adopt this system of slavery and she adopted it in that thorough manner which characterizes the Anglo-Saxon race. In no other country has prostitution been regulated by law It has been understood by the Latin races, even when morally enervated, that the law could not without risk of losing its majesty violate justice. In England alone the regulations are law. Their promoters, by their hardihood in asking parliament to decree injustice, have brought on unconsciously to themselves, the beginning of the end of the whole system. The Englishman is a powerful agent for evil as for good. In the best times of our history my countrymen possessed preëminently vigorous minds in vigorous bodies. But when the animal nature has outgrown the moral, the appetites burst their proper restraints, and man has no other notion of enjoyment save bodily pleasure; he passes by a quick and easy transition into a powerful brute. And this is what the upper-class Englishman has to a deplorable extent become. There is no creature in the world so ready as he to domineer, to enslave, to destroy. But together with this development towards evil, there has been in our country a counter development. Moral faith is still strong among us. There are powerful women, as well as strong, pure, and self-governed men, of the real old Anglo-Saxon type. It was in England then, which adopted last the hideous slavery, that there arose first a strong national protest in opposition. English people rose up against the wicked law before it had been in operation three months. English men and women determined to carry abolition not at home only, but abroad, and they promptly carried their standard to every country on the continent of Europe. In all these countries men and women came forward at the first appeal, and said, "We are

Digitized by Google

ready, we only waited for you, Anglo-Saxons, to take the lead; we have groaned under the oppression, but there was not force enough among us to take the initiative step."

We have recently had a visit from Monsieur Aimi Humbert of Switzerland, our able general secretary for the continent. Much encouragement was derived from the reports which reached us from France, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and even Spain, where a noble lady, Donna Concepcion Arenal of Madrid, and several gentlemen have warmly espoused our cause. The progress is truly encouraging; yet, on the other hand, it is obvious that the partisans of this legislation have recently been smitten with a kind of rage for extending the system everywhere, and are on the watch to introduce it wherever we are off our guard. In almost all British colonies they are very busy. At the Cape of Good Hope, where the Cape parliament had repealed the law, the governor, Sir Bartle Frere, has been induced by certain specialists and immoral men, to reintroduce it. But since he could not count on the parliament at Cape Town for doing this, he has reintroduced the miserable system by means of a proclamation or edict, without the sanction and probably, to a great extent, without the knowledge of parliament. The same game is being played in other colonies. These facts seem to point to a more decided and bitter struggle on the question than we have yet seen. An engergetic member of our executive committee, M. Pierson of Zetten, in Holland, says:

> I look upon legalized prostitution as the system in which the immorality of our age is crystalized, and that in attacking it we attack in reality the great enemies which are hiding themselves behind its ramparts. But if we do not soon overthrow these ramparts we must not think our work is fruitless. A great work is already achieved; sin is once more called sin instead of necessary evil, and the true standard of morality—equal for men and women, for rich and poor—is once more raised in the face of all the nations.

This legalization of vice which recognized the "necessity" of impurity for man and the institution of slavery for woman, is the most open denial which modern times have seen of the principle of the sacredness of the individual human being. It is the embodiment of socialism in its worst form. An English high-class journal confessed this, when it dared to demand that women who are unchaste shall henceforth be dealt with "not as human beings, but as foul sewers," or some such "material nuisance" without souls, without rights and without responsibilities. When the leaders of public opinion in a country have arrived at such a point of combined depotism as to recommend such a manner of dealing with human beings, there is no crime which that country may not legalize. Were it possible to secure the absolute physical health of a whole province, or an entire continent by the destruction of one, only one poor and sinful woman, woe to that nation which should dare, by that single act of destruction, to purchase this advantage to the many! It will do it at its peril.

We entreat our friends in America to renew their alliance with us in the sacred conflict. Union will be strength. The women of England are beginning to understand their responsibilities. Like yourselves, we are laboring to obtain the suffrage. The wrong which has fallen upon us in this legalizing of vice has taught us the need of power in legislation.

Digitized by Google

Meanwhile, the crusade against immorality is educating women for the right use of suffrage when they obtain it. The two movements must go hand in hand.

Altogether this was an impressive occasion in which women met heart to heart in discussing the deepest humiliations of their sex. After eloquent speeches by Mrs. Meriwether, Mrs. Spencer, Mrs. Leonard, Mrs. Thompson and Rev. Olympia Brown, the audience slowly dispersed.

The closing scenes of the evening were artistic and interesting. The platform was tastefully decked with flags and flowers, and the immense audience that had assembled at an early hour—hundreds unable to gain admission—made this the crowning session of the convention. Miss Couzins announced the receipt of an invitation from Mr. John Wahl, inviting the convention to visit the Merchants' Exchange, "with assurances of high regard." The announcement was heard with considerable merriment by those who remembered her criticisms on Mr. Wahl for his failure to deliver the address of welcome at the opening of the convention. She also announced the receipt of an invitation from Secretary Kalb to visit the fair-grounds, and moved that the convention first visit the Exchange and then proceed to the fair-grounds in carriages, the members of the Merchants' Exchange, of course paying the bill. The motion was carried amidst applause. An invitation was also received from Dr. Eliot, chancellor of Washington University, to attend the art lecture of Miss Schoonmaker at the Mary Institute, Monday evening. In a letter to the editor of the *National Citizen*, Mrs. Stanton thus describes the incident of the evening:

The delegates from the different States, through May Wright Thompson of Indianapolis, presented Miss Anthony with two baskets of exquisite flowers. She referred in the most happy way to Miss Anthony's untiring devotion to all the unpopular reforms through years of pitiless persecution, and thanked her in behalf of the young womanhood of the nation, that their path had been made smoother by her brave life. Miss Anthony was so overcome with the delicate compliments and the fragrant flowers at her feet, that for a few moments she could find no words to express her appreciation of the unexpected acknowledgement of what all American women owe her. As she stood before that hushed audience, her silence was more eloquent than words, for her emotion was shared by all. With an effort she at last said:

Friends, I have no words to express my gratitude for this marked attention. I have so long been the target for criticism and ridicule, I am so unused to praise, that I stand before you surprised and disarmed. If any one had come to this platform and

Digitized by Google

abused all womankind, called me hard names, ridiculed our arguments or denied the justice of our demands, I could with readiness and confidence have rushed to the defence, but I cannot make any apropriate reply for this offering of eloquent words and flowers, and I shall not attempt it.

Being advertised as the speaker of the evening, she at once began her address, and as she stood there and made an argument worthy a senator of the United States, I recalled the infinite patience with which, for upwards of thirty years, she had labored for temperance, anti-slavery and woman suffrage, with a faithfulness worthy the martyrs in the early days of the Christian church, and said to myself, verily the world now as ever crucifies its saviors.

Thanks to the untiring industry of Mrs. Minor and Miss Couzins, the convention was in every way a success, morally, financially, in crowded audiences, and in the fair, respectful and complimentary tone of the press. Looking over the proceedings and resolutions, the thought struck me that the National Association is the only organization that has steadily maintained the doctrine of federal power against State rights. The great truths set forth in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of United States supremacy, so clearly seen by us, seem to be vague and dim to our leading statesmen and lawyers if we may judge by their speeches and decisions. Your superb speech on State rights should be published in tract form and scattered over this entire nation. How can we ever have a homogeneous government so long as universal principles are bounded by State lines.

The delegates remaining in the city went on 'Change in a body at 12 o'clock Saturday, on invitation of the president, John Wahl. They were courteously received and speeches were made by Mesdames Couzins, Stanton, Anthony, Meriwether and Thompson. Mrs. Meriwether's speech was immediately telegraphed in full to Memphis. All wore badges of silk on which in gold letters appeared "N. W. S. A., May 10, 1879, Merchants' Exchange." From the Exchange the ladies proceeded in carriages to the fairgrounds, and Zoölogical Gardens where they took refreshments.

On Saturday evening Miss Couzins gave a delightful reception. Her parlors were crowded until a late hour, where the friends of woman suffrage had an opportunity to use their influence socially in converting many distinguished guests. On Sunday night Mrs. Stanton was invited by the Rev. Ross C. Houghton to occupy his pulpit in the Union Methodist church, the largest in the city of that denomination. She preached from the text in Genesis i., 27, 28. The sermon was published in the *St. Louis Globe* the next morning.* Mrs. Thompson was also in-

* Though an extra edition was struck off not a paper was to be had by 10 o'clock in the morning. Gov. Stannard and other prominent members of the suffrage association bought and mailed every copy they could obtain.

Digitized by Google

vited to occupy a Presbyterian pulpit, but imperative duties compelled her to leave the city.

The enthusiasm aroused by the convention in woman's enfranchisement was encouraging to those who had so long and earnestly labored in this cause.* This was indeed a week of profitable work. With arguments and appeals to man's reason and sense of justice on the platform, to his religious emotions and conscience in the pulpit, to his honor and courtesy in the parlor, all the varied influences of public and private life were exerted with marked effect; while the press on the wings of the wind carried the glad tidings of a new gospel for woman to every town and hamlet in the State.

* On the Tuesday following the convention a large number of St. Louis people met and formed a woman suffrage society, auxiliary to the National. Miss Anthony who had remained over, called the meeting to order; Mrs. E. C. Johnson made an effective speech; Mrs. Minor was chosen president. Over fifty persons enrolled as members. The second meeting held a fortnight after, was also crowded; twenty-five new members were obtained.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXIX.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS AND CONVENTIONS.

1880–1881.

Why we Hold Conventions in Washington—Lincoln Hall Demonstration—Sixty-six Thousand Appeals—Petitions Presented in Congress—Hon. T. W. Ferry of Michigan in the Senate—Hon. George B. Loring of Massachusetts in the House—Hon. J. J. Davis of North Carolina Objected—Twelfth Washington Convention—Hearings before the Judiciary Committees of both Houses—1880—May Anniversary at Indianapolis—Series of Western Conventions—Presidential Nominating Conventions—Delegates and Addresses to each—Mass-meeting at Chicago—Washington Convention, 1881—Memorial Service to Lucretia Mott—Mrs. Stanton's Eulogy—Discussion in the Senate on a Standing Committee—Senator McDonald of Indiana Championed the Measure—May Anniversary in Boston—Conventions in the Chief Cities of New England.

THE custom of holding conventions at the seat of government in mid-winter has many advantages. Congress is then in session, the Supreme Court sitting, and society, that mystic, headless, power, at the height of its glory. Being the season for official receptions, where one meets foreign diplomats from every civilized nation, it is the time chosen by strangers to visit our beautiful capital. Washington is the modern Rome to which all roads lead, the bright cynosure of all eyes, and is alike the hope and fear of worn-out politicians and aspiring pilgrims. From this great center varied influences radiate to the vast circumference of our land. Supreme-court decisions, congressional debates, presidential messages and popular opinions on all questions of fashion, etiquette and reform are heralded far and near, awakening new thought in every State in our nation and, through their representatives, in the aristocracies of the old world. Hence to hold a suffrage convention in Washington is to speak to the women of every civilized nation.

The Twelfth Annual Convention of the National Association assembled in Lincoln Hall, January 21, 1880. Many distinguished ladies and gentlemen occupied the platform, which was tastefully decorated with flags and flowers, and around the walls

Digitized by Google

hung familiar mottoes,* significant of the demands of the hour. On taking the chair Susan B. Anthony made some appropriate remarks as to the importance of the work of the association during the presidential campaign. Mrs. Spencer called the roll, and delegates † from sixteen States responded.

Mrs. Gage read the call:

The National Association will hold its twelfth annual convention in Lincoln Hall, Washington, D. C., January 21, 22, 1880.

The question as to whether we are a nation, or simply a confederacy of States, that has agitated the country from the inauguration of the government, was supposed to have been settled by the war and confirmed by the amendments, making United States citizenship and suffrage practically synonymous. Not, however, having been pressed to its logical results, the question as to the limits of State rights and national power is still under discussion, and is the fundamental principle that now divides the great national parties. As the final settlement of this principle involves the enfranchisement of woman, our question is one of national politics, and the real issue of the hour. If it is the duty of the general government to protect the freedmen of South Carolina and Louisiana in the exercise of their rights as United States citizens, the government owes the same protection to the women in Massachusetts and New York. This year will again witness an exciting presidental election, and this question of momentous importance to woman will be the issue then presented. Upon its final decision depends not only woman's speedy enfranchisement, but the existence of the republic.

A sixteenth amendment to the national constitution, prohibiting the States from disfranchising United States citizens on the ground of sex, will be urged upon the forty-sixth congress by petitions, arguments and appeals. The earnest, intelligent and far-seeing women of every State should assemble at the coming convention, and show by their wise counsels that they are worthy to be citizens of a free republic. All asso-

---

* "True labor reform: the ballot for woman, the unpaid laborer of the whole earth."

"Man's work is from sun to sun,
But woman's work is never done."

"Taxation without representation is tyranny. Woman is taxed to support pauperism and crime, and is compelled to feed and clothe the law-makers who oppress her."

"Women are voting on education, the bulwark of the republic, in Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Colorado, Oregon, New Hampshire and Massachusetts."

"Women are voting on all questions in Wyoming and Utah. The vote of women transformed Wyoming from barbarism to civilization."

"The financial problem for woman: equal pay for equal work, and one hundred cents on the dollar."

"When a woman *Will*, she WILL, and you may depend on it, she WILL vote."

† *California*, Jane B. Archibald; *Connecticut*, Julia E. Smith (Parker), E. C. Champion; *Delaware*, Mary A. Stuart; *District of Columbia*, Sara Andrews Spencer, Jane H. Spofford, Ellen H. Sheldon, Sara J. Messer, Amanda M. Best, Belva A. Lockwood, Mary A. S. Carey, Rosina M. Parnell, Mary L. Wooster, Helen Rand Tindall, Lura McNall Orme; *Illinois*, Miss Jessie Waite, daughter of Caroline V. and Judge Waite; *Indiana*, Zerelda G. Wallace, Emma Mont McRae; Flora M. Hardin; *Iowa*, Nancy R. Allen; *Kansas*, Della Ross; *Louisiana*, Elizabeth L. Saxon, *Maine*, Sophronia C. Snow; *Maryland*, Lavinia Dundore; *Michigan*, Catherine A. F. Stebbins; *Missouri*, Phœbe W. Couzins; *New Hampshire*, Marilla M. Ricker; *New Jersey*, Lucinda B. Chandler; *New York*, Susan B. Anthony, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Lillie Devereux Blake, Dr. A. W. Lozier, Jennie de M. Lozier, M. D., Helen M. Slocum; *Pennsylvania*, Rachel G. Foster, Julia T. Foster; *South Carolina*, Mary R. Pell.

Digitized by Google

ciations in the United States which believe it is the duty of congress to submit an amendment protecting woman in the exercise of the right of suffrage, are cordially invited to send delegates. Those who cannot attend the convention, are urged to address letters to their representatives in congress, asking them to give as careful attention to the proposed amendment and to the petitions and arguments urged in its behalf, as though the rights of men, only, were involved. A delegate from each section of the country will be heard before the committees of the House and Senate, to whom our petitions will be referred.*

Mrs. Spencer presented a series of resolutions which were ably discussed by the speakers and adopted:

Resolved, That we are a nation and not a mere confederacy, and that the right of citizens of the United States to self-government through the ballot should be guaranteed by the national constitution and protected everywhere under the national flag.

Resolved, That while States may have the right to regulate the time, place and manner of elections, and the qualifications of voters upon terms equally applicable to all citizens, they should be forbidden under heavy penalties to deprive any citizen of the right to self-government on account of sex.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the forty-sixth congress to immediately submit to the several States the amendment to the national constitution recently proposed by Senator Ferry and Representative Loring, and approved by the National Suffrage Association.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the House of Representatives to pass immediately the resolution recommended by the Committee on Rules directing the speaker to appoint a committee on the rights of women.

Resolved, That the giant labor reform of this age lies in securing to woman, the great unpaid and unrecognized laborer and producer of the whole earth, the fruits of her toil.

Resolved, That the theory of a masculine head to rule the family, the church, or the State, is contrary to republican principles, and the fruitful source of rebellion and corruption.

Resolved, That the assumption of the clergy, that woman has no right to participate in the ministry and offices of the church is unauthorized theocratic tyranny, placing a masculine mediator between woman and her God, which finds no authority in reason, and should be resisted by all women as an odious form of religious persecution.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the congress of the United States to provide a reform school for girls and a home for the children whom no man owns or protects, and who are left to die upon the streets of the nation's capital, or to grow up in ignorance, vice and crime.

Resolved, That since man has everywhere committed to woman the custody and ownership of the child born out of wedlock, and has required it to bear its mother's name, he should recognize woman's right as a mother to the custody of the child born in marriage, and permit it to bear her name.

Resolved, That the National Association will send a delegate and an alternate to each presidential nominating convention to demand the rights of woman, and to submit to each party the following plank for presidential platform: *Resolved*, That the right to use the ballot *inheres* in the citizen of the United States, and we pledge ourselves to secure protection in the exercise of this right to all citizens irrespective of sex.

Resolved, That one-half of the number of the supervisors of the tenth census, and one-half of the collectors of said census, should be educated, intelligent women, who can be safely entrusted to enumerate women and children, their occupations, ages,

* Signed by Matilda Joslyn Gage, *Chairman Executive Committee;* Susan B. Anthony, *Vice-president-at-large;* Sara Andrews Spencer, *Corresponding Secretary;* Jane H. Spofford, *Treasurer.*

Digitized by Google

diseases and deaths, and who would not be likely to overlook ten millions of housekeepers.

Resolved, That Ulysses S. Grant won his first victories through the military plans and rare genius of a woman, Anna Ella Carroll, of Maryland, and while he has been rewarded with the presidential office through two terms, and a royal voyage around the world, crowned with glory and honor, Miss Carroll has for fifteen years been suffering in poverty unrecognized and unrewarded.

Resolved, That the thanks of this association are hereby tendered to Governor Chas. B. Andrews, of Connecticut, for remembering in each annual message to ask for justice to women.

The comments of the press* were very complimentary, and their daily reports of the convention full and fair. Among the many letters† to the convention, the following from a Southern lady is both novel and amusing:

MEMPHIS, Tenn., December 11, 1889.

DEAR MRS. SPENCER: You want petitions. Well I have two which I got up some time ago, but did not send on because I thought the names too few to count much. The one is of *white* women 130 in number. The other contains 110 names of black women. This last is a curiosity, and was gotten up under the following circumstances:

Some ladies were dining with me and we each promised to get what names we could to petitions for woman suffrage. My servant who waited

* This week has been devoted almost exclusively to the women, who as temperance leaders, female suffragists and general reformers, have become a power in the land which can no longer be ridiculed or ignored. Yesterday Lincoln Hall was packed to its utmost capacity with such an audience as no other entertainment or amusement has ever before gathered in this city. Women of refinement and cultivation, of thought and purpose, women of standing and position in society, mothers of families, wives of clergymen, were there by the hundreds, to listen to the words of wisdom and eloquence that fell from the lips of that assembly, the most carefully organized, thoroughly governed, harmoniously acting association in this great country. Members of congress, professors of colleges, judges and gentlemen of leisure, sat or stood in admiration of the progress of the women, who are so earnestly striving to regenerate our beloved republic, over which the shadow of anarchy and dissolution is hovering with outspread wings. These women are no longer trembling suppliants, feeling their way cautiously and feebly amid an overpowering mass of obstructions; they are now strong in their might, in their unity, and in the righteousness of their cause. Men will do wisely if they attract this power instead of repelling it; if they permit women to work in concert with them, instead of compelling them to be arrayed against them. The fate of Governor Robinson and Senator Ecelstine of New York, indicates what they can do, and what they will do, if obliged to assume the attitude of aggressors. Congress has heard no such eloquence upon its floors this week as we have listened to from the lips of these noble women.—[Washington correspondent of the Portland (Me.) *Transcript*, Jan. 23, 1880.

These conventions occur yearly and although the ladies have fought long and hard, and seem to have not yet reached a positive assurance of success, still they continue to force the fight with greater earnestness and redoubled energy, and their meetings are conducted with much wisdom and decided spirit. There is one thing to the credit of these ladies which cannot be said of the opposite sex, and that is, their conventions are models of good order and parliamentary eloquence, and they put their work through in a graceful, business-like manner.—[Washington *Critic*, Jan. 21, 1880.

The announcement that the public session of the National Woman Suffrage Convention would begin at one o'clock yesterday afternoon at Lincoln Hall sufficed to attract a most brilliant audience, composed principally of ladies, occupying every seat and thronging the aisles. The inconvenience of remaining standing was patiently endured by hundreds who seemed loth to leave while the convention was in progress.—[Washington *National Republican*, Jan. 22, 1880.

The session of the Woman Suffrage Convention in Washington this week has developed the fact that these strong-minded women are making progress. The convention itself was composed of women of marked ability, and its proceedings were marked by dignity and decorum. The very best citizens of the city attended the meetings.—[Washington correspondent Syracuse *Daily Standard*.

† Letters were read from Mary Powers Filley, N. H; Martha G. Tunstall, Texas; M. A. Darling, Mich.; May Wright Thompson, Ind.; Sarah Burger Stearns, Minn.; Miss Martin, Ill.; W. G. Myers, O.; Annie L. Quinby, Ky.; Zina Young Williams, Utah; Barbara J. Thompson, Neb.; Mira L. Sturgis, Me.; Orra Langhorne, Va.; Emily P. Collins, La.; Charles P. Wellman, esq., Ga.

Digitized by Google

on table was a coal-black woman. She became interested and after the ladies went away asked me to explain the matter to her, which I did. She then said if I would give her a paper she could get a thousand names among the black women, that many of them felt that they were as much slaves to their husbands as ever they had been to their white masters. I gave her a petition, and said to her, "Tell the women this is to have a law passed that will not allow the men to *whip their wives*, and will put down drinking saloons." "Every black woman will go for that law!" She took the paper and procured these 110 signatures against the strong opposition of black men who in some cases threatened to whip their wives if they signed. At length the opposition was so great my servant had not courage to face it. She feared some bodily harm would be done her by the black men. You can see this is a genuine negro petition from the odd way the names are written, sometimes the capital letter in the middle of the name, sometimes at the end.

Yours, ELIZABETH AVERY MERIWETHER.

In response to 66,000 documents containing appeals to women, issued by the National Association, 250 petitions, signed by over 12,000, arrived in Washington in time for presentation to congress before the assembling of the convention, and were read on the floor of the Senate, with the leading names, January 14, 16, 20, 21, by forty-seven senators.

In the House of Representatives this courtesy (reading petitions and names), requires unanimous consent, and one man, Hon. J. J. Davis of North Carolina, who had no petition from the women of his State, objected. Sixty-five representatives presented the petitions at the clerk's desk, under the rule, January 14, 15, 16. In answer to these appeals to both Houses, on Monday, January 19, Hon. T. W. Ferry, of Michigan, introduced in the Senate a joint resolution for a sixteenth amendment, which with all the petitions was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Tuesday, January 20, Hon. George B. Loring, of Massachusetts, introduced the same resolution in the House of Representatives, and it was referred, with all the petitions, to the Committee on the Judiciary. There were also during this congress presented over 300 petitions from law-abiding, tax-paying women, praying for the removal of their political disabilities.

On Friday and Saturday, January 23, 24, these committees granted hearings of two hours each to delegates from ten States who had been in attendance at the convention. Thoughtful attention was given to arguments upon every phase of the question, and senators and representatives expressed a strong determination to bring the subject fairly before the people.

Digitized by Google

The committees especially requested that only the delegates should be present, wishing, as they said, to give their sole attention to the arguments undisturbed by the crowds who usually seek admittance. Even the press was shut out. These private sessions with most of the members present, and the close attention they gave to each speaker, were strong proof of the growth of our reform, as but a few years before representatives sought excuses for absence on all such occasions.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U. S. SENATE,
Friday, Jan. 23, 1880.

The committee assembled at half-past 10 o'clock A. M. Present, Mr. Thurman, *chairman*, Mr. McDonald, Mr. Bayard, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Edmunds.

The CHAIRMAN: Several members of the committee are unable to be here. Mr. Lamar is detained at his home in Mississippi by sickness; Mr. Carpenter is confined to his room by sickness; Mr. Conkling has been unwell; I do not know how he is this morning; and Mr. Garland is chairman of the Committee on Territories, which has a meeting this morning that he could not fail to attend. I do not think we are likely to have any more members of the committee than are here now, and we will hear you, ladies.

Mrs. ZERELDA G. WALLACE of Indiana said: *Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Committee:* It is scarcely necessary to say that there is not an effect without a cause. Therefore it would be well for the statesmen of this nation to ask themselves the question, What has brought the women from all parts of this nation to the capital at this time? What has been the strong motive that has taken us away from the quiet and comfort of our own homes and brought us before you to-day? As an answer to that question I will read an extract from a speech made by one of Indiana's statesmen. He found out by experience and gave us the benefit of it:

> You can go to meetings; you can vote resolutions; you can attend great demonstrations in the street; but, after all, the only occasion where the American citizen expresses his acts, his opinions, and his power is at the ballot-box; and that little ballot that he drops in there is the written sentiment of the times, and it is the power that he has as a citizen of this great republic.

That is the reason why we are here; the reason why we want to vote. We are not seditious women, clamoring for any peculiar rights; it is not the woman question that brings us before you to-day; it is the human question underlying this movement. We love and appreciate our country; we value its institutions. We realize that we owe great obligations to the men of this nation for what they have done. To their strength we owe the subjugation of all the material forces of the universe which give us comfort and luxury in our homes. To their brains we owe the machinery that gives us leisure for intellectual culture and achievement. To their education we owe the opening of our colleges and the establishment of our public schools, which give us these great

Digitized by Google

and glorious privileges. This movement is the legitimate result of this development, and of the suffering that woman has undergone in the ages past.

A short time ago I went before the legislature of Indiana with a petition signed by 25,000 of the best women in the State. I appeal to the memory of Judge McDonald to substantiate the truth of what I say. Judge McDonald knows that I am a home-loving, law-abiding, tax-paying woman of Indiana, and have been for fifty years. When I went before our legislature and found that one hundred of the vilest men in our State, merely by the possession of the ballot, had more influence with our law-makers than the wives and mothers it was a startling revelation.

You must admit that in popular government the ballot is the most potent means for all moral and social reforms. As members of society, we are deeply interested in all the social problems with which you have grappled so long unsuccessfully. We do not intend to depreciate your efforts, but you have attempted to do an impossible thing; to represent the whole by one-half, and because we are the other half we ask you to recognize our rights as citizens of this republic.

JULIA SMITH PARKER of Glastonbury, Conn., said: *Gentlemen:* You may be surprised to see a woman of over four-score years appear before you at this time. She came into the world and reached years of discretion before any person in this room was born. She now comes before you to plead that she can vote and have all the privileges that men have. She has suffered so much individually that she thought when she was young she had no right to speak before the men; but still she had courage to get an education equal to that of any man at the college, and she had to suffer a great deal on that account. She went to New Haven to school, and it was noised around that she had studied the languages. It was such an astonishing thing for girls at that time to have the advantages of education, that I had actually to go to cotillon parties to let people see that I had common sense. [Laughter.]

She has had to pay $200 a year in taxes without knowing what becomes of it. She does not know but that it goes to support grog-shops. She knows nothing about it. She has had to suffer her cows to be sold at the sign-post six times. She suffered her meadow land, worth $2,000, to be sold for a tax less than $50. If she could vote as the men do she would not have suffered this insult; and so much would not have been said against her as has been said if men did not have the whole power. I was told that they had the power to take anything that I owned if I would not exert myself to pay the money. I felt that I ought to have some little voice in determining what should be done with what I paid. I felt that I ought to own my own property; that it ought not to be in these men's hands; and I now come to plead that I may have the same privileges before the law that men have. I have seen what a difference there is, when I have had my cows sold, by having a voter to take my part.

I have come from an obscure town on the banks of the Connecticut, where I was born. I was brought up on a farm. I never had an idea that

Digitized by Google

I should come all the way to Washington to speak before those who had not come into existence when I was born. Now, I plead that there may be a sixteenth amendment, and that women may be allowed the privilege of owning their own property. I have suffered so much myself that I felt it might have some effect to plead before this honorable committee. I thank you, gentlemen, for hearing me so kindly.

ELIZABETH L. SAXON of Louisiana, said: *Gentlemen:* I feel that after Mrs. Wallace's plea there is no necessity for me to say anything. I come from the extreme South, she from the West. People have asked me why I came. I care nothing for suffrage merely to stand beside men, or rush to the polls, or to take any privilege outside of my home, only, as Mrs. Wallace says, for humanity. I never realized the importance of this cause, until we were beaten back on every side in the work of reform. If we attempted to put women in charge of prisons, believing that wherever woman sins and suffers women should be there to teach, help and guide, every place was in the hands of men. If we made an effort to get women on the school-boards we were combated and could do nothing.

In the State of Texas, I had a niece living whose father was an inmate of a lunatic asylum. She exerted as wide an influence as any woman in that State; I allude to Miss Mollie Moore, who was the ward of Mr. Cushing. I give this illustration as a reason why Southern women are taking part in this movement. Mr. Wallace had charge of that lunatic asylum for years. He was a good, honorable, able man. Every one was endeared to him; the State appreciated him as superintendent of this asylum. When a political change was made and Gov. Robinson came in, Dr. Wallace was ousted for political purposes. It almost broke the hearts of some of the women who had sons, daughters or husbands there. They determined at once to try and have him reinstated. It was impossible, he was out, and what could they do?

A gentleman said to me a few days ago, "These women ought to marry." I am married; I am a mother; and in our home the sons and brothers are all standing like a wall of steel at my back. I have cast aside the prejudices of the past. They lie like rotted hulks behind me.

After the fever of 1878, when our constitutional convention was about to convene, I suppressed the agony and grief of my own heart (for one of my children had died) and took part in the suffrage movement in Louisiana with the wife of Chief-Justice Merrick, Mrs. Sarah A. Dorsey, and Mrs. Harriet Keating of New York, the niece of Dr. Lozier. These three ladies aided me faithfully and ably. I went to Lieutenant-Governor Wiltz, and asked him if he would present or consider a petition which I wished to bring before the convention. He read the petition. One clause of our State law is that no woman can sign a will. Some ladies donated property to an asylum. They wrote the will and signed it themselves, and it was null and void, because they were women. That clause, perhaps, will be wiped out. Many gentlemen signed the petition on that account. Governor Wiltz, then lieutenant-governor, told me he would present the petition. He was elected president of the convention. I presented my first petition, signed by the best names in the city of New Orleans and

Digitized by Google

in the State. I had the names of seven of the most prominent physicians. Three prominent ministers signed it for moral purposes alone. When Mrs. Dorsey was on her dying bed the last time she ever signed her name was to a letter to go before that convention. Mrs. Merrick and myself addressed the convention. We made the petition then that we make here; that we, the mothers of the land, should not be barred on every side in the cause of reform. I pledged my father on his dying bed that I would never cease work until woman stood with man equal before the law.

I beg of you, gentlemen, to consider this question seriously. We stand precisely in the position of the colonies when they plead, and, in the words of Patrick Henry, were "spurned with contempt from the foot of the throne." We have been jeered and laughed at; but the question has passed out of the region of ridicule. This clamor for woman suffrage, for woman's rights, for equal representation, is extending all over the land.

I plead because my work has been combated in the cause of reform everywhere that I have tried to accomplish anything. The children that fill the houses of prostitution are not of foreign blood and race. They come from sweet American homes, and for every woman that went down some mother's heart broke. I plead by the power of the ballot to be allowed to help reform women and benefit mankind.

MARY A. STEWART of Delaware said: The negroes are a race inferior, you must admit, to your daughters, and yet that race has the ballot, and why? It is said they earned it and paid for it with their blood. Whose blood paid for yours? The blood of your forefathers and our forefathers. Does a man earn a hundred thousand dollars and lie down and die, saying, "It is all my boys'"? Not a bit of it. He dies saying, "Let my children, be they cripples, be they idiots, be they boys, or be they girls, inherit all my property alike." Then let us inherit the sweet boon of the ballot alike. When our fathers were driving the great ship of State we were willing to sail as deck or cabin passengers, just as we felt disposed; we had nothing to say; but to-day the boys are about to run the ship aground, and it is high time that the mothers should be asking, "What do you mean to do?" In our own little State the laws have been very much modified in regard to women. My father was the first man to blot out the old English law allowing the eldest son the right of inheritance to the real-estate. He took the first step, and like all those who take first steps in reform he received a mountain of curses from the oldest male heirs.

Since 1868 I have, by my own individual efforts, by the use of hard-earned money, gone to our legislature time after time and have had this law and that law passed for the benefit of women; and the same little ship of State has sailed on. To-day our men are just as well satisfied with the laws in force in our State for the benefit of women as they were years ago. A woman now has a right to make a will. She can hold bonds and mortgages of her own. She has a right to her own property. She cannot sell it though, if it is real-estate, simply because the moment she marries, her husband has his right of courtesy. The woman does not grumble at

Digitized by Google

that; but still when he dies owning real-estate, she gets only the rental value of one-third, which is called the widow's dower. Now I think the man ought to have the rental value of one-third of the woman's maiden property or real-estate, and it ought to be called the widower's dower. It would be just as fair for one as for the other. All that I want is equality.

The women of our State, as I said before, are taxed without representation. The tax-gatherer comes every year and demands taxes. For twenty years I have paid tax under protest, and if I live twenty years longer I shall pay it under protest every time. The tax-gatherer came to my place not long since. "Well," said I, "good morning, sir." Said he, "Good morning." He smiled and said, "I have come bothering you." Said I, "I know your face well. You have come to get a right nice little woman's tongue-lashing." Said he, "I suppose so, but if you will just pay your tax I will leave." I paid the tax, "But," said I, "remember I pay it under protest, and if I ever pay another tax I intend to have the protest written and make the tax-gatherer sign it before I pay the tax, and if he will not sign that protest then I shall not pay, and there will be a fight at once," Said he, "Why do you keep all the time protesting against paying this small tax?" Said I, "Why do you pay your tax?" "Well," said he, "I would not pay it if I did not vote." Said I, "That is the very reason why I do not want to pay it. I cannot vote." Who stay at home from the election? The women, and the black and white men who have been to the whipping-post. Nice company to put your wives and daughters in.

It is said that the women do not want to vote. Every woman sitting here wants to vote, and must we be debarred the privilege of voting because some luxurious woman, rolling around in her carriage in her little downy nest that some good, benevolent man has provided for her, does not want to vote? There was a society that existed up in the State of New York called the Covenanters that never voted. Were all you men disfranchised because that class or sect up in New York would not vote? Did you all pay your taxes and stay at home and refrain from voting because the Covenanters did not vote? Not a bit of it. You went to the election and told them to stay at home if they wanted to, but that you, as citizens, were going to take care of yourselves. That was right. We, as citizens, want to take care of ourselves.

One more thought, and I will be through. The fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, in my opinion, and in the opinion of a great many smart men in the country, and smart women, too, give the right to women to vote without any "if's" or "and's" about it, and the United States protects us in it; but there are a few who construe the law to suit themselves, and say that those amendments do not mean that, because the congress which passed the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments had no such intention. Well, if that congress overlooked us, let the wiser congress of to-day take the eighth chapter and the fourth verse of the Psalms, which says, "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?" and amend it by adding, "What is woman, that they never thought of her?"

Digitized by Google

NANCY R. ALLEN of Iowa said: *Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee:* I am a representative of a large class of women of Iowa, who are heavy taxpayers. There is now a petition being circulated throughout our State, to be presented to the legislature, praying that women be exempted from taxation until they have some voice in the management of the affairs of the State. You may ask, "Do not your husbands protect you? Are not all the men protecting you?" We answer that our husbands are grand, noble men, who are willing to do all they can for us, but there are many who have no husbands and who own a great deal of property in the State of Iowa. Particularly in great moral reforms the women there feel the need of the ballot. By presenting long petitions to the legislature they have succeeded in having better temperance laws enacted, but the men have failed to elect the officials who will enforce those laws. Consequently they have become as dead letters upon the statute books.

To refer again to taxes. I have a list showing that in my city three women pay more taxes than all the city officials together. They are good temperance women. Our city council is composed almost entirely of saloon-keepers, brewers and men who patronize them. There are some good men, but they are in the minority, and the voices of these women are but little regarded. All these officials are paid, and we have to help support them. As Sumner said, "Equality of rights is the first of rights." If we can only be equal with man under the law, it is all that we ask. We do not propose to relinquish our domestic life, but we do ask that we may be represented.

Remarks were also made by Mrs. Chandler, Mrs. Archibald and Mrs. Spencer. The time having expired, the committee voted to give another hour to Miss Anthony to state the reasons why we ask congress to submit a proposition to the several legislatures for a sixteenth amendment, instead of asking the States to submit the question to the popular vote of their electors.* When Miss Anthony had finished, the chairman, Senator Thurman of Ohio, said:

I have to say, ladies, that you will admit that we have listened to you with great attention, and I can certainly say, with great interest; your appeals will be duly and earnestly considered by the committee.

Mrs. WALLACE: I wish to make just one remark in reference to what Senator Thurman said as to the popular vote being against woman suffrage. The popular vote is against it, but not the popular voice. Owing to the temperance agitation in the last six years, the growth of the suffrage sentiment among the wives and mothers of this nation has largely increased.

* Judge Edmunds meeting Miss Anthony afterwards, complimented her on having made an argument instead of what is usually given before committees, platform oratory. He said her logic was sound, her points unanswerable. Nor were the delegates familiar with that line of argument less impressed by it, given as it was without notes and amid many interruptions. It was one of those occasions rarely reached, in which the speaker showed the full height to which she was capable of rising. We have not space for the whole argument, and the train of reasoning is too close to be broken.—[M. J. G.

Digitized by Google

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 24, 1880.

The CHAIRMAN *pro tem.* (Mr. HARRIS of Virginia): The order of business for the present session of the committee is the delivery of arguments by delegates of the Woman Suffrage Convention now holding its sessions in Washington. I am informed that the delegates are in attendance upon the committee. We will be pleased to hear them. A list of the names of the ladies proposing to speak, with a memorandum of the limit of time allotted to each, has been handed to me for my guidance; and, in the absence of the chairman [Mr. Knott] it will be my duty to confine the speakers to the number of minutes apportioned to them respectively upon the paper before me. As an additional consideration for adhering to the regulation, I will mention that members of the committee have informed me that, having made engagements to be at the departments and elsewhere on business appointments, they will be compelled to leave the committee-room upon the expiration of the time assigned. The first name upon the list is that of Mrs. Emma Mont. McRae of Indiana, to whom five minutes are allowed.

Mrs. MCRAE said: *Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee:* In Indiana the cause of woman has made marked advancement. At the same time we realize that we need the right to vote in order that we may have protection. We need the ballot because through the medium of its power alone we can hope to wield that influence in the making of laws affecting our own and our children's interests.

Some recent occurences in Indiana, one in particular in the section of the State from which I come, have impressed us more sensibly than ever before with the necessity of this right. The particular incident to which I refer was this: In the town of Muncie, where I reside, a young girl, who for the past five years had been employed as a clerk in the post-office, and upon whom a widowed mother was dependent for support, was told on the first of January that she was no longer needed in the office. She had filled her place well; no complaint had been made against her. She very modestly asked the postmaster the cause of her discharge, and he replied: "We have a man who has done work for the party and we must give that man a place; I haven't room for both of you." Now, there you have at once the reason why we want the ballot; we want to be able to do something for the party in a substantial way, so that men may not tell us they have no room for us because we do nothing *for the party.* When they have the ballot women will work for "the party" as a means of enabling them to hold places in which they may get bread for their mothers and for their children if necessity requires.

Miss JESSIE T. WAITE of Illinois said: *Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee:* In the State of Illinois we have attained to almost every right except that of the ballot. We have been admitted to all the schools and colleges; we have become accustomed to parliamentary usages; to voting in literary societies and in all matters connected with the interests of the colleges and schools; we are considered members in good standing of the associations, and, in some cases, the young ladies in the institutes have been told they hold the balance of power. The same

Digitized by Google

reason for woman suffrage that has been given by the delegate from Indiana [Mrs. McRae] holds good with reference to the State of Illinois. Women must have the ballot that they may have protection in getting bread for themselves and their families, by giving to the party that looks for their support some substantial evidence of their strength. Experience has demonstrated, especially in the temperance movement, how fruitless are all their efforts while the ballot is withheld from their hands. They have prayed; they have petitioned; they have talked; they have lectured; they have done all they could do, except to vote; and yet all avails them nothing. Miss Frances Williard presented to the legislature of Illinois a petition of such length that it would have reached around this room. It contained over 180,000 signatures. The purpose of the petition was to have the legislature give the women of the State the right to vote upon the question of license or no license in their respective districts.

In some of the counties of our State we have ladies as superintendents of schools and professors in colleges. One of the professors in the Industrial University at Champaign is a lady. Throughout the State you may find ladies who excel in every branch of study and in every trade. It was a lady who took the prize at "the Exposition" for the most beautiful piece of cabinet-work. This is said to have been a marvel of beauty and extraordinary as a specimen of fine art. She was a foreigner; a Scandinavian, I believe. Another lady is a teacher of wood-carving We have physicians, and there are two attorneys, Perry and Martin, now practicing in the city of Chicago. Representatives of our sex are also to be found among real-estate agents and journalists, while, in one or two instances as preachers they have been recognized in the churches.

CATHERINE A. STEBBINS of Michigan said: "Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay!" So said the poet; and I say, Better a week with these inspired women in conference than years of an indifferent, conventional society! Their presence has been a blessing to the people of this District, and will prove in the future a blessing to our government. These women from all sections of our country, with a moral and spiritual enthusiasm which seeks to lift the burdens of our government, come to you, telling of the obstacles that have beset their path. They have tried to heal the stricken in vice and ignorance; to save our land from disintegration. One has sought to reform the drunkard, to save the moderate drinker, to convert the liquor-seller; another, to shelter the homeless; another, to lift and save the abandoned woman. "Abandoned?" once asked a prophet-like man of our time, who added, "There never was an abandoned woman without an abandoned man!" Abandoned of whom? let us ask. Surely not by the merciful Father. No; neither man nor woman is ever abandoned by him, and he sends his instruments in the persons of some of these great-hearted women, to appeal to you to restore their God-given freedom of action, that "the least of these" may be remembered.

But in our councils no one has dwelt upon *one* of the great evils of our civilization, the scourge of war; though it has been said that women will

Digitized by Google

fight. It is true there are instances in which they have considered it a duty; there were such in the rebellion. But the majority of women would not declare war, would not enlist soldiers and would not vote supplies and equipments, because many of the most thoughtful believe there *is* a better way, and that women can bring a moral power to bear that shall make war needless.

Let us take one picture representative of the general features of the war—we say nothing of our convictions in regard to the conflict. Ulysses S. Grant or Anna Ella Carroll makes plans and maps for the campaign; McClellan and Meade are commanded to collect the columbiads, muskets and ammunition, and move their men to the attack. At the same time the saintly Clara Barton collects her cordials, medicines and delicacies, her lint and bandages, and, putting them in the ambulance assigned, joins the same moving train. McClellan's men meet the enemy, and men—brothers—on both sides fall by the death-dealing missiles. Miss Barton and her aids bear off the sufferers, staunch their bleeding wounds, soothe the reeling brain, bandage the crippled limbs, pour in the oil and wine, and make as easy as may be the soldier's bed. What a solemn and heart-rending farce is here enacted! And yet in our present development men and women seek to reconcile it with the requirements of religion and the necessities of our conflicting lives. So few recognize the absolute truth!

Mrs. Devereux Blake said: *Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Committee:* I come here with your own laws in my hands—and the volume is quite a heavy one, too—to ask you whether women are citizens of this nation? I find in this book, under the heading of the chapter on "Citizenship," the following:

Sec. 1,992. All persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are declared to be citizens of the United States

I suppose you will admit that women are, in the language of the section, "persons," and that we cannot reasonably be included in the class spoken of as "Indians not taxed." Therefore I claim that we are "citizens." The same chapter also contains the following:

Sec. 1,994. Any woman who is now or may hereafter be married to a citizen of the United States, and who might herself be lawfully naturalized, shall be deemed a citizen.

Under this section also we are citizens. I am myself, as indeed are most of the ladies present, married to a citizen of the United States; so that we are citizens under this count if we were not citizens before. Then, further, in the legislation known as "The Civil Rights Bill," I find this language:

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and territory, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishments, pains, penalties, etc.

One would think the logical conclusion from that which I have last read would be that *all citizens* are entitled to equal protection everywhere.

Digitized by Google

It appears to mean that. Then I turn to another piece of legislation—that which is known as "The Enforcement Act"—one which some of you, gentlemen, did not like very much when it was enacted—and there I find another declaration on the same question. The act is entitled "An Act to Enforce the Right of Citizens of the United States to Vote in the Several States of this Union, and for other purposes." The right of "citizens" to vote appears to be conceded by this act. In the second section it says:

It shall be the duty of every such person and officer to give to all citizens of the United States the same and equal opportunity to perform such prerequisite, and to become qualified to vote, without distinction of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

I ask you, gentlemen of the committee, as lawyers, whether you do not think that, after we have been declared to be citizens, we have the right to claim the protection of this enforcement act? When you gentlemen from the North rise in your places in the halls of congress and make these walls ring with your eloquence, you are prone to talk a great deal about the right of every United States citizen to the ballot, and the necessity of protecting every such citizen in its exercise. What do you mean by it?

It occurs to me here to call your attention to a matter of recent occurrence. As you know, there has been a little unpleasantness in Maine—a State which is not without a representative among the members of the Judiciary Committee—and certain gentlemen there, especially Mr. Blaine, have been greatly exercised in their minds because, as they allege, the people of Maine have not been permitted to express their will at the polls. Why, gentlemen, I assert that a majority of the people of Maine have never been permitted to express their will at the polls. A majority of the people of Maine are women, and from the foundation of this government have never exercised any of the inalienable rights of citizens. Mr. Blaine made a speech a day or two ago in Augusta. He began by reciting the condition of affairs, owing to the effort, as he states, "to substitute a false count for an honest ballot," and congratulated his audience upon the instrumentalities by which they had triumphed—

Without firing a gun, without shedding a drop of blood, without striking a single blow, without one disorderly assemblage. *The people* have regained their own right through the might and majesty of their own laws.

He goes on in this vein to speak of those whom he calls "the people of Maine." Well, gentlemen, I do not think you will deny that *women are people.* It appears to me that what Mr. Blaine said in that connection was nonsense, unless indeed he forgot that there were any others than men among the people of the State of Maine. I don't suppose that you, gentlemen, are often so forgetful. Mr. Blaine said further:

The Republicans of Maine and throughout the land felt that they were not merely fighting the battle of a single year, but for all the future of the State; not merely fighting the battle of our own State alone, but for all the States that are attempting the great problem of State government throughout the world. The corruption or destruction of the ballot is a crime against free government, and when successful is a subversion of free government.

Digitized by Google

Does that mean the ballot *for men only* or the ballot *for the people*, men and women too? If it is to be received as meaning anything, it ought to mean not for one sex alone, but for both. Mr. Lincoln declared, in one of his noblest utterances, that no man was good enough to govern another man without that man's consent. Of course he meant it in its broadest terms; he meant that no man or woman was good enough to govern another man or woman without that other man's or woman's consent.

Mr. Blaine, on another occasion, in connection with the same subject-matter, had much to say of the enormity of the oppression practiced by his political opponents in depriving the town of Portland of the right of representation in view of its paying such heavy taxes as it does pay. He expressed the greatest indignation at the attempt, forgetting utterly that great body of women who pay taxes but are deprived of the right of representation. In this connection it may be pertinent for me to express the hope, by way of a suggestion, that hereafter, when making your speeches, you will not use the term "citizens" in a broad sense, unless you mean to include women as well as men, and that when you do not mean to include women you will speak of male citizens as a separate class, because the term, in its general application, is illogical and its meaning obscure if not self-contradictory.

President Hayes was so pleased with one of the sentences in his message of a year ago that in his message of this year he has reiterated it. It reads thus:

> That no temporary or administrative interests of government will ever displace the zeal of our people in defense of the primary rights of citizenship, and that the power of public opinion will override all political prejudices and all sectional and State attachments in demanding that all over our wide territory the name and character of citizen of the United States shall mean one and the same thing and carry with them unchallenged security and respect.

Let me suggest what he ought to have said unless he intended to include women, although I am afraid that Mr. Hayes, when he wrote this, forgot that there were women in the United States, notwithstanding that his excellent wife, perhaps, stood by his side. He ought to have said:

> An act having been passed to enforce the rights of *male* citizens to vote, the true vigor of *half* the population is thus expressed, and no interests of government will ever displace the zeal of *half* of our people in defense of the primary rights of our *male* citizens. *The prosperity of the States depends upon the protection afforded to our male citizens;* and the name and character of *male* citizens of the United States shall mean one and the same thing and carry with them unchallenged security and respect.

If Mr. Hayes had thus expressed himself, he would have made a perfectly logical and clear statement. Gentlemen, I hope that hereafter, when speaking or voting in behalf of the citizens of the United States, you will bear this in mind and will remember that women are citizens as well as men, and that they claim the same rights.

This question of woman suffrage cannot much longer be ignored. In the State from which I come, although we have not a right to vote, we are confident that the influence which women brought to bear in determining the result of the election last fall had something to do with sending into retirement a Democratic governor who was opposed to our reform, and

Digitized by Google

electing a Republican who was in favor of it. Recollect, gentlemen, that the expenditure of time and money which has been made in this cause will not be without its effect. The time is coming when the demand of an immense number of the women of this country cannot be ignored. When you see these representatives coming from all the States of the Union to ask for this right, can you doubt that, some day, they will succeed in their mission? We do not stand before you to plead as beggars; we ask for that which is our right. We ask it as due to the memory of our ancestors, who fought for the freedom of this country just as bravely as did yours. We ask it on many considerations. Why, gentlemen, the very furniture here, the carpet on this floor, was paid for with our money. We are taxed equally with the men to defray the expenses of this congress, and we have a right equally with them to participate in the government.

In closing, I have only to ask, is there no man here present who appreciates the emergencies of this hour? Is there no one among you who will rise on the floor of congress as the champion of this unrepresented half of the people of the United States? The time is not far distant when we shall have our liberties, and the politician who can now understand the importance of our cause, the statesman who can now see, and will now appreciate the justice of it, that man, if true to himself, will write his name high on the scroll of fame beside those of the men who have been the saviors of the country. Gentlemen I entreat you not to let this hearing go by without giving due weight to all that we have said. You can no more stay the onward current of this reform than you can fight against the stars in their courses.

Mr. WILLITS of Michigan: *Mr. Chairman:* I would like to make a suggestion here. The regulation amendment, as it has heretofore been submitted, provided that the right of citizens of the United States to vote should not be abridged on account of sex. I notice that the amendment which the ladies here now propose has prefixed to it this phrase: "The right of suffrage in the United States shall be based on citizenship." I call attention to this because I would like to have them explain as fully as they may why they incorporate the phrase, "shall be based on citizenship." Is the meaning this, that all citizens shall have the right to vote, or simply that citizenship shall be the basis of suffrage? The words, "or for any reason not applicable to all citizens of the United States," also seem to require explanation. The proposition in the form in which it is now submitted, I understand, covers a little more than has been covered by the amendment submitted in previous years.

SARA A. SPENCER of Washington, D. C.: If the committee will permit me, I will say that the amendment in its present form is the concentrated wish of the women of the United States. The women of the country sent to congress petitions asking for three different forms of constitutional amendment, and when preparing the one now before the committee these three were concentrated in the one now before you (identical with that of the resolution offered in the House by Hon. George B. Loring and by Hon. T. W. Ferry in the Senate), omitting, at the request of each of the

three classes of petitioners, all phrases which were regarded by any of them as objectionable. The amendment as now presented is therefore the combined wish of the women of the country, viz., that citizenship in the United States shall mean suffrage, and that no one shall be deprived of the right to vote for reasons not equally applicable to all citizens.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE said: It is necessary to refer to a remarkable decision of the Supreme Court. The case of Virginia L. Minor, claiming the right to vote under the fourteenth amendment, was argued before the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1874; decision rendered adversely by Chief-Justice Waite, March, 1875, upon the ground that "the United States had no voters in the States of its own creation." This was a most amazing decision to emanate from the highest judicial authority of the nation, and is but another proof how fully that body is under the influence of the dominant political party.

Contrary to this decision, I unhesitatingly affirm that the United States has possessed voters in States of its own creation from the very date of the constitution. In Article I, Sec. 2, the constitution provides that

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

The persons so designated are voters under State laws; but by this section of the national constitution they are made United States voters. It is directed under what conditions of State qualification they may cast votes in their respective States for members of the lower house of congress. The constitution here created a class of United States voters by adoption of an already voting class. Did but this single instance exist, it would be sufficient to nullify Chief-Justice Waite's decision, as Article VI, Sec. 2, declares

> The constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land.

This supreme law at its very inception created a class of United States voters. If in the Minor case alone, the premises of the Supreme Court and Chief-Justice Waite were wrong, the decision possesses no legal value; but in addition to this class, the United States, by special laws and amendments has from time to time created other classes of United States voters.

Under the naturalization laws citizenship is recognized as the basis of suffrage. No State can admit a foreigner to the right of the ballot, even under United States laws, unless he is already a citizen, or has formally declared his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States. The creation of the right here is national; its regulation, local.

Men who commit crimes against the civil laws of the United States forfeit their rights of citizenship. State law cannot re-habilitate them, but within the last five years 2,500 such men have been pardoned by congressional enactment, and thus again been made voters in States by United States law. Is it not strange that with a knowledge of these facts before him Chief-Justice Waite could base his decision against the right of a

Digitized by Google

woman to the ballot, on the ground that the United States had no voters in the States of its own creation?

Criminals against the military law of the United States, who receive pardon, are still another class of voters thus created. A very large body of men, several hundred thousand, forfeited their rights of citizenship, their ballot, by participation in the rebellion; they were political criminals. When general amnesty was proclaimed they again secured the ballot. They had been deprived of the suffrage by United States law and it was restored to them by the same law.

It may be replied that the rebellious States had been reduced to the condition of territories, over whose suffrage the general government had control. But let me ask why, then, a large class of men remained disfranchised after these States again took up local government? A large class of men were especially exempted from general amnesty and for the restoration of their political rights were obliged to individually petition congress for the removal of their political disabilities, and these men then became "voters in States," by action of the United States. Here, again, the United States recognized citizenship and suffrage as synonymous. If the United States has no voters of its own creation in the States, what are these men? A few, the leaders in the rebellion, are yet disfranchised, and no State has power to change this condition. Only the United States can again make them voters in States.

Under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments the colored men of the South, who never had possessed the ballot, and those colored men of the North over whom some special disqualification hung, were alike made voters by United States law. It required no action of Delaware, Indiana, New York, or any of those States in which the colored man was not upon voting equality with the white men, to change their constitutions or statutes in order to do away with such disqualifications. The fourteenth amendment created another class of United States voters in States, to the number of a million or more. The fourteenth amendment, and the act of congress to enforce it, were at once recognized to be superior to State law—abrogating and repealing State constitutions and State laws contradictory to its provisions.

By an act of congress March 3, and a presidential proclamation of March 11, 1865, all deserters who failed to report themselves to a provost marshall within sixty days, forfeited their rights of citizenship as an additional penalty for the crime of desertion, thus losing their ballot without possibility of its restoration except by an act of congress. Whenever this may be done collectively or individually, these men will become State voters by and through the United States law.

As proving the sophistry used by legal minds in order to hide from themselves and the world the fact that the United States has power over the ballot in States, mention may be made of a case which, in 1866, came before Justice Strong, then a member of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, but since a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. For sophistical reasoning it is a curiosity in legal decisions. One point made by Judge Strong was, that congress may deprive a citizen of the oppor-

Digitized by Google

tunity to enjoy a right belonging to him as a citizen of a State even the right of voting, but cannot deprive him of the right itself. This is on a par with saying that congress may deprive a citizen of the opportunity to enjoy a right belonging to him as an individual, even the right of life, but cannot deprive him of life itself.

A still more remarkable class of United States voters than any yet mentioned, exists. Soon after the close of the war congress enacted a law that foreigners having served in the civil war and been honorably discharged from the army, should be allowed to vote. And this, too, without the announcement of their intention of becoming citizens of the republic. A class of United States voters were thus created out of a class of non-citizens.

I have mentioned eight classes of United States voters, and yet not one of the States has been deprived of the powers necessary to local self-government. To States belong all matters of strictly local interest, such as the incorporation of towns and cities, the settlement of county and other boundaries; laws of marriage, divorce, protection of life and property, etc. It has been said, the ordaining and establishment of a constitution for the government of a State is always the act of a State in its highest sovereign capacity, but if any question as to nationality ever existed, it was settled by the war. Even State constitutions were found unable to stand when in conflict with a law of the United States or an amendment to its constitution. All are bound by the authority of the nation.

This theory of State sovereignty must have a word. When the Union was formed several of the States did not even frame a constitution. It was in 1818 that Connecticut adopted her first State constitution. Rhode Island had no constitution until 1842. Prior to these years the government of these States was administered under the authority of royal charters brought out from England.

Where was their State sovereignty? The rights even of suffrage enjoyed by citizens of these States during these respective periods of forty-two and sixty-six years, were either secured them by monarchial England or republican United States. If by the latter all voters in these two States during these years were United States voters. It is a historical fact that no State save Texas was ever for an hour sovereign or independent. The experience of the country proves there is but one real sovereignty. It has been said, with truth,

> There is but one sovereign State on the American continent known to international or constitutional law, and that is the republic itself. This forms the United States and should be so called.

I ask for a sixteenth amendment because this republic is a nation and not a confederacy of States. I ask it because the United States not only possesses inherent power to protect its citizens but also because of its national duty to secure to all its citizens the exercise of their rights of self-government. I ask it because having created classes of voters in numberless instances, it is most flagrant injustice to deny this protection to woman. I ask it because the Nation and not the State is supreme.

Digitized by Google

PHŒBE W. COUZINS of Missouri, to whom had been assigned the next thirty minutes, said: *Mr. Chairman, and Gentlemen of the Judiciary Committee:* I am invited to speak of the dangers which beset us at this hour in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Mrs. Minor's case, which not only stultifies its previous interpretation of the recent constitutional amendments and makes them a dead letter, but will rank, in the coming ages, in the history of the judiciary, with the Dred Scott decision. The law, as explained in the Dred Scott case, was an infamous one, which trampled upon the most solemn rights of the loyal citizens of the government, and declared the constitution to mean anything or nothing, as the case might be. Yet the decision in that case had a saving clause, for it was not the unanimous voice of a Democratic judiciary. Dissenting opinions were nobly uttered from the bench. In the more recent case, under the rule of a Republican judiciary created by a party professing to be one of justice, the rights of one-half of the people were deliberately abrogated without a dissenting voice. This violation of the fundamental principles of our government called forth no protest. In all of the decisions against woman in the Republican court, there has not been found one Lord Mansfield, who, rising to the supreme height of an unbiased judgment, would give the immortal decree that shall crown with regal dignity the mother of the race: "I care not for the dictates of judges, however eminent, if they be contrary to principle. If the parties will have judgment, let justice be done, though the heavens fall."

The Dred Scott decision declared as the law of citizenship, "to be a citizen is to have actual possession and enjoyment, or the perfect right to the acquisition and enjoyment of an entire equality of privileges, civil and political." But the slave-power was then dominant and the court decided that a black man was not a citizen because he had not the right to vote. But when the constitution was so amended as to make "all persons born or naturalized in the United States citizens thereof," a negro, by virtue of his United States citizenship, was declared, under the amendments, a voter in every State in the Union. And the Supreme Court reaffirmed this right in the celebrated slaughter-house cases (16 Wallace, 71). It said, "The negro, having by the fourteenth amendment, been declared to be a citizen of the United States, is thus made a voter in ever State in the Union."

But when the loyal women of Missouri, apprehending that "all persons beneath the flag were made citizens and voters by the fourteenth amendment," through Mrs. Minor, applied to the Supreme Court for protection in the exercise of that same right, this high tribunal, reversing all its former decisions, proclaims State sovereignty superior to national authority. This it does in this strange language: "Being born in the United States, a woman is a person and therefore a citizen"—we are much obliged to them for that definition of our identity as persons—"but the constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon any one." And then, in the face of its previous decisions, the court declared: "The United States has no voters in the States of its own creation", that the elective officers of the United States are all elected, directly or indirectly,

Digitized by Google

by State voters. It remands woman to the States for her protection, thus giving to the State the supreme authority and overthrowing the entire results of the war, which was fought to maintain national supremacy over any and all subjects in which the rights and privileges of the citizens of the United States are involved.

No supreme allegiance, gentlemen of the committee, can be claimed for or by a government, if it has no citizens of its own creation, and constitutional amendments cannot confer authority over matters which have no existence in the constitution. Thus, our supreme law-givers hold themselves up for obloquy and ridicule in their interpretation of the most solemn rights of loyal citizens, and make our constitutional law to mean anything or nothing as the case may be. You will see, gentlemen, that the very point which the South contended for as the true one is here acknowledged to be the true one by the Supreme Court—that of State rights superior to national authority. The whole of the recent contest hinged upon this. The appeal to arms and the constitutional amendments were to establish the subordination of the State to national supremacy, to maintain the national authority over any and all subjects in which the rights and privileges of the citizens of the United States were involved; but this decision in Mrs. Minor's case completely nullifies the supreme authority of the government, and gives the States more than has hitherto been claimed for them by the advocates of State rights. The subject of the franchise is thus wholly withdrawn from federal supervision and control. If "the United States has no citizens of its own creation," of course no supreme allegiance can be claimed over the various citizens of the States.

The constitutional amendments cannot confer authority over a matter which has no existence in the constitution. If it has no voters, it can have nothing whatever to do with the elections and voting in the States; yet the United States invaded the State of New York, sent its officers there to try, convict, and sentence Miss Anthony for exercising a right in her own State which they declared the United States had no jurisdiction over. They send United States troops into the South to protect the negro in his right to vote, and then declare they have no jurisdiction over his voting. Then, mark the grave results which may and can follow this decision and legislation. I do not imagine that the Supreme Court, in its cowardly dodging of woman's right to all the rights and privileges which citizenship involves, designed to completely abrogate the principles established by the recent contest, or to nullify the ensuing legislation on the subject. But it certainly has done all this; for it must logically follow that if the United States has no citizens, it cannot legislate upon the rights of citizens, and the recent amendments are devoid of authority. It has well been suggested by Mr. Minor, in his criticism of the decision, that if members of the House of Representatives are elected by *State* voters, as the Supreme Court has declared, there is no reason why States may not refuse to elect them as in 1860, and thus deprive congress of its power. And if a sufficient number could be united to recall at their pleasure these representatives, what authority has the federal govern-

Digitized by Google

ment, under this decision, for coërcing them into subjection or refusing them a separation, if all these voters in the States desired an independent existence? None whatever. Mr. Garfield, in the House, in his speech last March, calls attention to this subject, but does not allude to the fact that the Supreme Court has already opened the door. He says:

There are several ways in which our government may be annihilated without the firing of a gun. For example, suppose the people of the United States should say, we will elect no representatives to congress. Of course this is a violent supposition; but suppose that they do not. Is there any remedy? Does our constitution provide any remedy whatever? In two years there would be no House of Representatives; of course, no support of the government and no government. Suppose, again, the States should say, through their legislatures, we will elect no senators. Such abstention alone would absolutely destroy this government; and our system provides no process of compulsion to prevent it. Again, suppose the two houses were to assemble in their usual order, and a majority of one in this body or in the Senate should firmly band themselves together and say, we will vote to adjourn the moment the hour of meeting arrives, and continue so to vote at every session during our two years of existence—the government would perish, and there is no provision of the constitution to prevent it.

The States may inform their representatives that they can do this; and, under this position, they have the power and the right so to do.

Gentlemen, we are now on the verge of one of the most important presidential campaigns. The party in power holds its reins by a very uncertain tenure. If the decision shall favor the one which has been on the anxious bench for lo! these twenty years, and in probation until hope has well-nigh departed, what may be its action if invested again with the control of the destinies of this nation? The next party in power may inquire, and answer, by what right and how far the Southern States are bound by the legislation in which they had no part or consent. And if the Supreme Court of a Republican judiciary now declares, *after* the war, *after* the constitutional amendments, that federal suffrage does not exist and never had an existence in the constitution, it follows that the South has the right to regulate and control all of the questions arising upon suffrage in the several States without any interference on the part of an authority which declares it has no jurisdiction. An able writer has said:

All injustice at last works out a loss. The great ledger of nations does not report a good balance for injustice. It has always met fearful losses. The irrepealable law of justice will, sooner or later, grind a nation to powder if it fail to establish that equilibrium of allegiance and protection which is the essential end of all government. Woe to that nation which thinks lightly of the duties it owes to its citizens and imagines that governments are not bound by moral laws.

It was the tax on tea—woman's drink prerogative—which precipitated the rebellion of 1776. To allay the irritation of the colonies, all taxes were rescinded save that on tea, which was left to indicate King George's dominion. But our revolutionary fathers and mothers said, "No; the tax is paltry, but the principle is great"; and Eve, as usual, pointed the moral for Adam's benefit. A most suggestive picture, one which aroused the intensest patriotism of the colonies, was that of a woman pinioned by her arms to the ground by a British peer, with a British red-coat holding her with one hand and with the other forcibly thrusting down her

Digitized by Google

throat the contents of a tea-pot, which she heroically spewed back in his face; while the figure of Justice, in the distance, wept over this prostrate Liberty. Now, gentlemen, we might well adopt a similar representation. Here is Miss Smith of Glastonbury, Conn., whose cows have been sold every year by the government, contending for the same principle as our forefathers—that of resistance to taxation without representation. We might have a picture of a cow, with an American tax-collector at the horns, a foreign-born assessor at the heels, forcibly selling the birthright of an American citizen, while Julia and Abby Smith, in the background, with veiled faces, weep over the degeneracy of Republican leadership.

But there are those in authority in the government who do not believe in this decision by the Supreme Court of the United States. The attorney-general, in his instructions to the United States marshals and their deputies or assistants in the Southern States, when speaking of the countenance and support of all good citizens of the United States in the respective districts of the marshals, remarks:

> It is not necessary to say that it is upon such countenance and support that the United States mainly rely in their endeavor to enforce the right to vote which they have given or have secured.

You notice the phraseology. Again, he says:

> The laws of the United States are supreme, and so, consequently, is the action of officials of the United States in enforcing them.

Secretary Sherman said in his speech at Steubenville, July 6:

> The negroes are free and are citizens and voters. That, at least, is a part of the constitution and cannot be changed.

And President Hayes in his two last messages, as Mrs. Blake recited to you, has declared that—

> United States citizenship shall mean one and the same thing and carry with it all over our wide territory unchallenged security and respect.

And that is what we ask for women.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I say to you that a sense of justice is the sovereign power of the human mind, the most unyielding of any; it rewards with a higher sanction, it punishes with a deeper agony than any earthly tribunal. It never slumbers, never dies. It constantly utters and demands justice by the eternal rule of right, truth and equity. And on these eternal foundation-stones we stand.

Crowning the dome of this great building there stands the majestic figure of a woman representing Liberty. It was no idealistic thought or accident of vision which gave us Liberty prefigured by a woman. It is the great soul of the universe pointing the final revelation yet to come to humanity, the prophecy of the ages—the last to be first.*

When the proposition to print these speeches came before the House a prolonged debate against it showed the readiness of the opposition to avail themselves of every legal technicality to de-

* Speeches were also made by Mrs. Saxon, Mrs. Spencer and Miss Anthony.

Digitized by Google

prive women of equal rights and privileges. But the measure finally passed and the documents were printed. To the Hon. Elbridge G. Lapham of New York we were largely indebted for the success of this measure.

The Washington *Republican* of February 6, 1880, describes a novel event that took place at that time:

In the Supreme Court of the United States, on Monday, on motion of Mrs. Belva Lockwood, Samuel R. Lowry of Alabama was admitted to practice. Mr. Lowry is president of the Huntsville, Ala., industrial school, and a gentleman of high attainments. It was quite fitting that the first woman admitted to practice before this court should move the admission of the first Southern colored man. Both will doubtless make good records as representatives of their respective classes. This scene was characterized by George W. Julian as one of the most impressive he ever witnessed—a fitting subject for an historical painting.

In 1880, women were for the first time appointed census enumerators. Gen. Francis Walker, head of that department, said there was no legal obstacle to the appointment of women as enumerators, and he would gladly confirm the nomination of suitable candidates. Very different was the action of the head of the post-office department, who refused, on the ground of sex, the application of 500 women for appointment as letter-carriers.

In view of the important work to be done in a presidential campaign, the National Association decided to issue an appeal to the women of the country to appoint delegates from each State and territory, and prepare an address to each of the presidential nominating conventions. In Washington a move was made for an act of incorporation in order that the Association might legally receive bequests. Tracts containing a general statement of the status of the movement were mailed to all members of congress and officers of the government.

At a meeting of the Committee on Rules, Mr. Randall, a Democratic member of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Garfield, a Republican member of Ohio, reminded Mr. Frye of Maine that he had been instructed by that committee, nearly a year before, to present to the House a resolution on the rights of women. The *Congressional Record* of March 27 contains the following:

Mr. FRYE: I am instructed by the Committee on Rules to report a resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee on the political rights of women, and to move that it be placed on the House calendar.

Mr. CONGER: Let it be read.

Digitized by Google

The clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the speaker appoint a special committee of nine members, to whom shall be referred all memorials, petitions, bills and resolutions relating to the rights of the women of the United States, with power to hear the same and report thereon by bill or otherwise. The resolution was referred to the House calendar.

This was a proof of the advancing status of our question that both Republican and Democratic leaders regarded the "rights of women" worthy the consideration of a special committee.

In the spring of 1880, the National Association held a series of mass meetings in the States of Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin and Michigan, commencing with the May anniversary in Indianapolis, at which sixteen States were represented.* The convention was held in Park Theatre, Miss Anthony presiding. The arrangements devolved chiefly on Mrs. May Wright Thompson, who discharged her responsibilities in a most praiseworthy manner, providing entertainment for the speakers, and paying all the expenses from the treasury of the local association. A series of resolutions was presented, discussed by a large number of the delegates, and adopted.

In accordance with the plan decided upon in Washington of attending all the nominating conventions, the next meeting was held in Chicago, beginning on the same day with the Republican convention. Farwell Hall was filled at an early hour; Miss Anthony in the chair. A large number of delegates † were present

---

* *Alabama*, Mrs. P. Holmes Drake, Huntsville. *Connecticut*, Elizabeth C. Champion, Bridgeport. *District of Columbia*, Belva A. Lockwood, Eveleen L. Mason, Jerusha G. Joy, Ellen H. Sheldon, Sara Andrews Spencer, Jane H. Spofford. *Illinois*, Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, vice-president of the National Association and editor of the "Woman's Kingdom" in the *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, Evanston; Dr. Ann M. Porter, Danville. *Indiana*, Mary E. Haggart, vice-president; Martha Grimes, Zerelda G. Wallace, May Wright Thompson, A. P. Stanton, Indianapolis; Salome McCain, Frances Joslin, Crawfordsville; Mrs. Helen M. Gougar, editor of the "Bric-a-brac department" of the *Lafayette Courier*, Lafayette; Thomas Atkinson, Oxford; Mrs. Dr. Rogers, Greencastle; Florence M. Hardin, Pendelton. *Iowa*, Mrs. J. C. M'Kinney, Mrs. Weiser, Decorah. *Kentucky*, Mary B. Clay, Richmond; Mrs. Carr, Mrs. E. T. Housh, Louisville. *Louisiana*, Elizabeth L. Saxon, New Orleans. *Maryland*, Mary A. Butler, Baltimore. *Michigan*, Catherine A. F. Stebbins, Detroit. *Missouri*, Mrs. Virginia L. Minor, Mrs. Eliza J. Patrick, Mrs. Annie T. Anderson, Mrs. Caroline Johnson Todd, Mrs. Endie J. Polk, Miss Phœbe Couzins, Miss M. A. Baumgarten, Miss Emma Neave, Miss Eliza B. Buckley, St. Louis; Mrs. Frances Montgomery, Oregon. *New Hampshire*, Parker Pillsbury, Concord. *New Jersey*, Lucinda B. Chandler. *New York*, Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Gage, Miss Anthony. *Ohio*, Mrs. Amanda B. Merrian, Mrs. Cordelia A. Plimpton, Cincinnati; Sophia L. O. Allen, Eva L. Pinney, South Newberry; Mrs. N. L. Braffet, New Paris. *Pennsylvania*, Rachel Foster, Julia T. Foster, Philadelphia. *South Carolina*, Mary R. Pell, Cowden P. O.

†*Colorado*, Florence M. Haynes, Greely. *Connecticut*, Elizabeth C. Champion, Bridgeport. *District of Columbia*, Belva A. Lockwood, Sara Andrews Spencer, Jane H. Spofford, Ellen H. Sheldon, Eveleen L. Mason, Jersuha G. Joy, Helen Rand Tindall, Amanda M. Best, Washington. *Illinois*, Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Sarah Hackett Stephenson, Kate Newell Doggett, Catherine V. Waite, Elizabeth J. Loomis, Alma Van Winkle, Chicago; Dr. Ann Porter, Danville; Mrs. F. Lillebridge, Rockford; Ann L. Barnett, Lockport; Mrs. F. A. Ross, Mrs. I. R. Lewison, Mansfield; Amanda Smith, Prophetstown. *Indiana*, Helen M. Gougar, Lafayette; Dr. Rachel B. Swain, Gertrude Garrison, Indianapolis. *Iowa*, Nancy R. Allen, Maquoketa; Jane C. M'Kinney, Mrs. Weiser, Decorah; Virginia Cornish, Hamburg; Ellen J. Foster, Clinton; Clara F. Harkness, Humboldt. *Kansas*,

Digitized by Google

from every part of the Union, among whom were many of the most distinguished advocates of woman suffrage. Mrs. Harbert gave an eloquent address of welcome.

Committees were appointed to visit the delegates from the different States to the Republican convention, to secure seats for the members of the National Association, and to ask that a plank recommending a sixteenth amendment be incorporated in the platform adopted by the Republican party. The proprietor of the Palmer House gave the use of a large parlor to the Association for business meetings and the reception of Republican delegates, many of whom were in favor of a woman's plank in their platform, and of giving the ladies seats in the convention. Strenuous efforts had been made to this end. One hundred and eighteen senators and representatives addressed a letter to the chairman of the National Republican committee—Don Cameron—asking that seventy-six seats should be given in the convention to the representatives of the National Woman Suffrage Association. It would naturally be deemed that a request, proceeding from such a source, would be heeded. The men who made it were holding the highest positions in the body politic; but the party managers presumed to disregard this request, and also the vote of the committee. The question of furnishing seats for our delegates was brought up before the close of their deliberations by Mr. Finnell, of Kentucky, who said:

A committee of women have been here and they ask for seventy-six seats in this convention. I move that they be furnished.

Mr. Cary of Wyoming, made some remarks showing that woman suffrage in his territory had been to the advantage of the Republican party, and seconded the motion of Mr. Finnell, which was adopted. The following resolution of the Arkansas delegation to the National Republican convention was read and received with enthusiasm:

Amanda B. Way, Elizabeth M'Kinney, Kenneth. *Kentucky*, Mary B. Clay, Sallie Clay Bennett, Richmond. *Louisiana*, Elizabeth L. Saxon, New Orleans. *Maryland*, Mary A. Butler, Baltimore. *Massachusetts*, Addie N. Ayres, Boston. *Minnesota*, A. H. Street, Albert Lee. *Michigan*, Catherine A. F. Stebbins, Detroit; Eliza Burt Gamble, Miss Mattie Smedly, East Saginaw; P. Engle Travis, Hartford; Dr. Elizabeth Miller, South Frankford. *Missouri*, Virginia L. Minor, Phœbe W. Couzins, Annie T. Anderson, Caroline J. Todd, St. Louis; Dr. Augusta Smith, Springfield. *New Hampshire*, Parker Pillsbury, Concord. *Nebraska*, Harriet S. Brooks, Omaha; Dr. Amy R. Post, Hastings. *New Jersey*, Margaret H. Ravenhill. *New York*, Susan B. Anthony, Rochester; Matilda Joslyn Gage, Fayetteville; Lillie Devereux Blake, New York city. *Ohio*, Eva L. Pinney, South Newbury; Julia B. Cole. *Oregon*, Mrs. A. J. Duniway (as substitute), Portland. *Pennsylvania*, Rachel Foster, Julia T. Foster, Lucinda B. Chandler Philadelphia; Cornelia H. Scarborough, New Hope. *South Carolina*, Mary R. Pell, Cowden P. O. *Tennessee*, Elizabeth Avery Meriwether, Memphis. *Wisconsin*, Rev. Olympia Brown, Racine; Almedia B. Gray, Schofield Mills. *Wyoming Territory*, Amelia B. Post.

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to secure to women the exercise of their right to vote.

It is here to be noted that not only were the Arkansas delegation of Republicans favorable to the recognition of woman suffrage in the platform of that party, but that the Southern delegates were largely united in that demand. Mr. New told the ladies that the Grant men had voted as a unit in favor of the women, while the Blaine and Sherman men unanimously voted against them.

But the ladies, well knowing the uncertainty of politicians, were soon upon the way to the committee-room, to secure positive assurance from the lips of the chairman himself—Don Cameron of Pennsylvania—that such tickets should be forthcoming, when they were stopped by a messenger hurrying after them to announce the presence of the secretary of the committee, Hon. John New, at their headquarters, in the grand parlor of the Palmer House, with a communication in regard to the tickets. He said the seventy-six seats voted by the committee had been reduced to *ten* by its chairman, and these ten were not offered to the Association in its official capacity, but as complimentary or "guest tickets," for a seat on the platform back of the presiding officers.

The Committee on Resolutions, popularly known as the platform committee, held a meeting in the Palmer House, June 2, to which Belva A. Lockwood obtained admission. On motion of Mr. Fredley of Indiana, Mrs. Lockwood was given permission to present the memorial of the National Woman Suffrage Association to the Republican party.

To the Republican Party in Convention assembled, Chicago, June 2, 1880:

Seventy-six delegates from local, State and National suffrage associations, representing every section of the United States, are here to-day to ask you to place the following plank in your platform:

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to secure to women the exercise of their right to vote.

We ask you to pledge yourselves to protect the rights of one-half of the American people, and to thus carry your own principles to their logical results. The thirteenth amendment of 1865, abolishing slavery, the fourteenth of 1867, defining citizenship, and the fifteenth of 1870, securing United States citizens in their right to vote, and your prolonged and powerful debates on all the great issues involved in our civil conflict, stand as enduring monuments to the honor of the Republican party. Impelled by the ever growing demand among women for a voice in the laws they are required to obey, for their rightful share in the government of this re-

public, various State legislatures have conceded partial suffrage. But the great duty remains of securing to woman her right to have her opinions on all questions counted at the ballot-box.

You cannot live on the noble words and deeds of those who inaugurated the Republican party. You should vie with those men in great achievements. Progress is the law of national life. You must have a new, vital issue to rouse once more the enthusiasm of the people. Our question of human rights answers this demand. The two great political parties are alike divided upon finance, free-trade, labor reform and general questions of political economy. The essential point in which you differ from the Democratic party is national supremacy, and it is on this very issue we make our demand, and ask that our rights as United States citizens be secured by an amendment to the national constitution. To carry this measure is not only your privilege but your duty. Your pledge to enfranchise ten millions of women will rouse an enthusiasm which must count in the coming closely contested election. But above expediency is right, and to do justice is ever the highest political wisdom.

The committee then adjourned to meet at the Sherman-house club room, where they reassembled at 8 o'clock. Soon after the calling to order of our own convention in Farwell Hall, word came that a hearing had been accorded before the platform committee. This proved to be a sub-committee. Ten minutes were given Miss Anthony to plead the cause of 10,000,000—yes, 20,000,000 citizens of this republic (?), while, watch in hand, Mr. Pierrepont sat to strike the gavel when this time expired. Ten minutes!! Twice has the great Republican party, in the plenitude of its power, allowed woman *ten* minutes to plead her cause before it. Ten minutes twice in the past eight years, while all the remainder of the time it has been fighting for power and place and continued life, heedless of the wrongs and injustice it was constantly perpetrating towards one-half the people. Ten minutes! What a period in the history of time. Small hope remained of a committee, with such a chairman, introducing a plank for woman suffrage.

The whole Arkansas delegation had expressed itself in favor; most of the Kentucky delegation were known to be so, while New York not only had friends to woman suffrage among its number, but even an officer of the State association was a delegate to the Republican convention. These men were called upon, a form of plank placed in their hands and they were asked to offer it as an amendment when the committee reported, but that plan was blocked by a motion that all resolutions should be referred to the committee for action.

Digitized by Google

Senator Farr of Michigan, a colored man, was the only member of the platform committee who suggested the insertion of a woman suffrage plank, the Michigan delegation to a man, favoring such action. The delegates were ready in case opportunity offered, to present the address to the convention. But no such moment arrived.

The mass convention had been called for June 2, but the crowds in the city gave promise of such extended interest that Farwell Hall was engaged for June 1, and before the second day's proceedings closed, funds were voluntarily raised by the audience to continue the meeting the third day. So vast was the number of letters and postals addressed to the convention from all parts of the country from women who desired to vote, that the whole time of each session could have been spent in reading them—one day's mail alone bringing letters and postals from twenty-three States and three territories. Some of these letters contained hundreds of names, others represented town, county, and State societies. Many were addressed to the different nominating conventions, Republican, Greenback, Democratic, while the reasons given for desiring to vote, ranged from the simple demand, through all the scale of reasons connected with good government and morality. So highly important a contribution to history did the Chicago Historical Society* deem these expressions of woman's desire to vote, that it made a formal request to be put in possession of *all* letters and postals, with a promise that they should be carefully guarded in a fire-proof safe.

---

* Historical Society Rooms, 140–42 Dearborn Ave., Chicago, May 19, 1880.

Mrs. E. C. Stanton, President National Woman Suffrage Association, 476 West Lake street:

Dear Madam: I write you in behalf of the Chicago Historical Society, and with the hope that you will obligingly secure for and present to this society a full manuscript record of the *mass-meeting* to be held in Farwell Hall in this city, June 2, 1880, duly signed by its officers. We hope too you will do the society the great favor to deposit in its archives all the letters and postals which you may receive in response to your invitations to attend that meeting.

This meeting may be an important one and long to be remembered. It is hard to measure the possibilities of 1880. I hope this meeting will mark an epoch in American history equal to the convention held in Independence Hall in 1776. How valuable would be the attested manuscript record of that convention and the correspondence connected therewith! The records of the Farwell-hall meeting may be equally valuable one hundred years hence. Please let the records be kept in the city in which the convention or mass-meeting is held.

I am a Republican. I hope the party to which I belong will be consistent. On the highest stripe of its banner is inscribed "Freedom and Equal Rights." I hope the party will not be so inconsistent as to refuse to the "better half" of the people of the United States the rights enjoyed by the liberated slaves at the South.

The leaders should not be content *to suffer it to be so*, but should work with a will to make it so. I have but little confidence in the sincerity of the man who will shout himself hoarse about "shot guns" and "intimidation" at the South, when ridicule and sneers come from his "shot gun" pointed at those who advocate the doctrine that our mothers, wives and sisters are as well qualified to vote and hold official position as the average Senegambian of Mississippi.

We should be glad to have you and your friends call at these rooms, which are open and free for all.

Very Respectfully, A. D. Hager, *Librarian*

Digitized by Google

After the eloquent speeches* of the closing session, Miss Alice S. Mitchell sang Julia Ward Howe's "Battle Hymn of the Republic," Mrs. Harbert playing the accompaniment, and the immense audience of 3,000 people joining in the chorus. This convention held three sessions each day, and at all except the last an admission fee was charged, and yet the hall was densely crowded throughout. For enthusiasm, nothing ever surpassed these meetings in the history of the suffrage movement. A platform and resolution were adopted as the voice of the convention.

The special object of the National Woman Suffrage Association is to secure national protection for women in the exercise of their right of suffrage. It recognizes the fact that our government was formed on the political basis of the consent of the governed, and that the Declaration of Independence struck a blow at every existing form by declaring the individual to be the source of all power. The members of this association, outside of our great question, have diverse political affiliations, but for the purpose of gaining this great right to the ballot, its members hold their party predilections in abeyance; therefore,

Resolved, That in this year of presidential nominations and political campaigns, we announce our determination to support no party by whatever name called, unless such party shall, in its platform, first emphatically endorse our demand for a recognition of the exact and permanent political equality of all citizens.

A delegation † went to the Greenback convention and presented the following memorial:

When a new political party is formed it should be based upon the principles of justice to all classes hitherto unrecognized. The finance question, as broad as it is, does not reach down to the deepest wrong in the nation. Beneath this question lies that of the denial of the right of self-government to one-half the people. It is impossible to secure the property rights of the people without first recognizing their personal rights. More than any class of men, woman represents the great unpaid laborer of the world—a slave, who, as wife and daughter, absolutely works for her board and clothes. The question of finance deeply interests

* By Mrs. Saxon of New Orleans, La.; Mrs. Meriwether of Memphis, Mrs. Sallie Clay Bennett, daughter of Cassius M. Clay of Richmond Ky.; and others. Mrs. Bennett related a little home incident. She said: A few days ago she was in her front yard planting with her own hands some roses, when "our ex-governor," passing by, exclaimed: "Mrs. Bennett, I admire that in you; whatever one wants well done he must do himself." She immediately answered: "That is true Governor, and that is why we women suffragists have determined to do our own voting hereafter." She then informed him that she wanted to speak to him on that great question. He was rather anxious to avoid the argument, and expressed his surprise and "was sorry to see a woman like her, surrounded by so many blessings, with a kind husband, numerous friends and loving children, advocating woman suffrage! She ought to be contented with these. She was not like Miss Anthony—" "Stop, Governor," I exclaimed, "Don't think of comparing me to that lady, for I feel that I am not worthy to touch the hem of her garments." She was, she said, indeed the mother of five dear children, but she [Miss Anthony] is the mother of a nation of women. She thought the women feared God rather than man, and it was only this which encouraged them to speak on this subject, so dear to their hearts, in public. One lady gave as a reason why she wanted to vote, that it was because "the men did not want them to," which evoked considerable merriment. This induced the chair to remind the audience of Napoleon's rule: "Go, see what your enemy does not want you to do and do it." Of the audience the *Inter-Ocean* said: "The speakers of all the sessions were listened to with rapt attention by the audience, and the points made were heartily applauded. It would be difficult to gather so large an audience of our sex whose appearance would be more suggestive of refinement and intelligence."

† Miss Anthony, Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Chandler, Mrs. Spencer and Mrs. Haggart.

woman, but her opinions upon it are valueless while deprived of the right of enforcing them at the ballot box. You are here in convention assembled, not alone to nominate a candidate for president, but also to promulgate your platform of principles to the world. Now is your golden opportunity. The Republican party presents no vital issue to the country; its platform is a repetition of the platitudes of the past twenty years. It has ceased to be a party of principles. It lives on the past. The deeds of dead men hold it together. Its disregard of principles has thrown opportunity into your hands. Will you make yourselves the party of the future? Will you recognize woman's right of self-government? Will you make woman suffrage an underlying principle in your platform? If you will make these pledges, the National Association will work for the triumph of your party in the approaching closely contested campaign.

The ladies were accorded hearings by several delegations previous to the assembling of the convention. A resolution committee of one from each State was appointed, and each member allowed two minutes to present either by speech or writing such principles as it requested incorporated in the platform. Lucinda B. Chandler, being a Greenbacker on principle, was a regularly elected delegate and by courtesy was added to a sub committee on resolutions. The one prepared by the National Association was placed in her hands, but, as she was forbidden t speak upon it, her support could only be given by vote, and a meaningless substitute took its place. The courtesy of placing Mrs. Chandler upon the committee was like much of man's boasted chivalry to woman, a seeming favor at the expense of right.

After trying in vain for recognition as a political factor from the Republican and Greenback nominating conventions the delegates went to Cincinnati.*

Committees were at once appointed to visit the different delegations. Women were better treated by the Democrats at Cincinnati than by the Republicans at Chicago. A committee-room in Music Hall was at once placed at their disposal, placards pointing to their headquarters were printed by the local committee at its own expense, and sixteen seats given to the ladies upon the floor of the house, just back of the regular delegates. A hearing † before the platform committee was granted with no limit as to time. At the close a delegate approached the table, saying,

* Twenty delegates from eleven different States, who had been in attendance at Chicago, went to Cincinnati.

† Before which Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Meriwether, Miss Anthony, Mrs. Spencer and Mrs. Blake spoke.

Digitized by Google

"I favor giving woman a plank," "So do I," replied Mr. Watterson, chairman of the committee. Many delegates in conversation, favored the recognition of woman's political rights, and a large number of the platform committee favored the introduction of the following plank:

That the Democratic party, recognizing the rapid growth of the woman suffrage question, suggests a consideration of this important subject by the people in anticipation of the time, near at hand, when it must become a political issue.

But although the platform committee sat until 2 A. M., no such result was reached, in consequence, it was said, of the objection of the extreme Southern element which feared the political recognition of negro women of the South.

The delegations from Maine, Kansas and New York were favorable, and offered the Association the use of their committee-rooms at the Burnett House and the Grand Hotel whenever desired. Mayor Prince of Boston not only offered a committee-room but secured seats for the delegates on the floor of the house. Mr. Henry Watterson, of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, as chairman of the Platform Committee, extended every courtesy within his power. Mayor Harrison of Chicago did his best to secure to the delegates a hearing before the convention. He offered to escort Miss Anthony to the platform that she might at least present the address. "You may be prevented," suggested one. "I'd like to see them do it," he replied. "Have I not just brought about a reconciliation between Tammany and the rest of New York?" Taking Miss Anthony upon his arm and telling her not to flinch, he made his way to the platform, when the chairman, Hon. Wade Hampton of South Carolina, politely offered her a seat, and ordered the clerk to read the address:

To the Democratic Party in Nominating Convention Assembled, Cincinnati, June 22, 1880:

On behalf of the women of the country we appear before you, asking the recognition of woman's political rights as one-half the people. We ask no special privileges, no special legislation. We simply ask that you live up to the principles enunciated by the Democratic party from the time of Jefferson. By what principle of democracy do men assume to legislate for women? Women are part of the people; your very name signifies government by the people. When you deny political rights to women you are false to your own principles.

The Declaration of Independence recognized human rights as its basis. Constitutions should also be general in character. But in opposition to this principle the party in power for the last twenty years has

perverted the Constitution of the United States by the introduction of the word "male" three times, thereby limiting the application of its guarantees to a special class. It should be your pride and your duty to restore the constitution to its original basis by the adoption of a sixteenth amendment, securing to women the right of suffrage; and thus establish the equality of all United States citizens before the law.

Not for the first time do we make of you these demands. At your nominating convention in New York, in 1868, Susan B. Anthony appeared before you, asking recognition of woman's inherent natural rights. At your convention of 1872, in Baltimore, Isabella Beecher Hooker and Susan B. Anthony made a similar appeal. In 1876, at St. Louis, Phœbe W. Couzins and Virginia L. Minor presented our claims. Now, in 1880, our delegates are present here from the Middle States, from the West and from the South. The women of the South are rapidly uniting in their demand for political recognition, as they have been the most deeply humiliated by a recognition of the political rights of their former slaves.

To secure to 20,000,000 of women the rights of citizenship is to base your party on the eternal principles of justice; it is to make yourselves the party of the future; it is to do away with a more extended slavery than that of 4,000,000 of blacks; it is to secure political freedom to half the nation; it is to establish on this continent the democratic theory of the equal rights of the people.

In furtherance of this demand we ask you to adopt the following resolution:

WHEREAS, Believing in the self-evident truth that all persons are created with certain inalienable rights, and that for the protection of these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; therefore,

Resolved, That the Democratic party pledges itself to use all its powers to secure to the women of the nation protection in the exercise of their right of suffrage.

On behalf of the National Woman Suffrage Association.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Chairman Executive Committee.*

That the women however, in the campaign of 1880, received the best treatment at the hands of the National Prohibition party is shown by the following invitation received at the Bloomington convention:

To the National Woman Suffrage Association of the United States:

The woman suffragists are respectfully invited to meet with and participate in the proceedings of the National Prohibition Convention to be held at Cleveland, Ohio, June, 1880.

JAMES BLACK, *Chairman of National Committee.*

Per J. W. HAGGARD.

A letter was received from Mr. Black urging the acceptance of the invitation. Accordingly Miss Phœbe Couzins was sent as a delegate from the association. The Prohibition party in its eleventh plank said:

Digitized by Google

We also demand that women having privileges as citizens in other respects, shall be clothed with the ballot for their own protection, and as a rightful means for a proper settlement of the liquor question.

After attending all these nominating conventions, some of the delegates * went to Wisconsin where the State and National Associations held a joint convention, in the Opera House at Milwaukee, June 4, 5. Madam Anneke gave the address of welcome.† Fresh from the exciting scenes of the presidential conventions, the speakers were unusually earnest and aggressive. The resolutions discussed at the Indianapolis convention were considered and adopted. Carl Doerflinger read a greeting in behalf of the German Radicals of the city. Letters were read from prominent persons, expressing their interest in the movement.‡ Dr. Laura Ross Wolcott made all the arrangements and contributed largely to the expenses of the convention. The roll of delegates shows that the State, at least, was well represented.§

Thus through the terrible heat of June this band of earnest women held successive conventions in Bloomington, Ill., Grand Rapids, Mich., Lafayette and Terre Haute, Ind. They were most hospitably entertained, and immense audiences greeted them at every point. Mrs. Cordelia Briggs took the entire responsibility of the social and financial interests of the convention at Grand Rapids, which continued for three days with increasing enthusiasm to the close. Mrs. Helen M. Gougar made the arrangements for Lafayette which were in every way successful.

After the holding of these conventions, delegations from the National Association called on the nominees of the two great parties to ascertain their opinions and proposed action, if any, on the question of woman suffrage. Mrs. Blake, and other ladies representing the New York city society, called on General Hancock at his residence and were most courteously received. In

* Miss Anthony, Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Meriwether, Mrs. Saxon, Miss. Couzins, Rev. Olympia Brown, Misses Rachel and Julia Foster.

† This was the last time this noble German woman honored our platform, as her eventful life closed a few years after.

‡ Among others, from Assemblyman Lord, State-Superintendent-of-Public-Instruction Whitford, J. M. Bingham and Superintendent MacAlister.

§ The delegates were Olympia Brown, *Racine*; L. C. Galt, M. M. Frazier, *Mukwonago*; E. A. Brown, *Berlin*; E. M. Cooley, *Eureka*; E. L. Woolcott, *Ripon*; O. M. Patton, M. D., *Appleton*; H. Suhm, E. Hohgrave, *Sauk City*; M. W. Mabbs, C. M. Stowers, *Manitowoc*; S. C. Guernsey, *Janesville*; H. T. Patchin, *New London*; Jennie Pomeroy, *Grand Rapids*; Mrs. H. W. Rice, *Oconomowoc*; Amy Winship, *Racine*; Almedia B. Gray, Matilda Graves, Jessie Gray, *Scholfield Mills*; Mrs. Mary Collins, *Mukwonago*; Mrs. Jere Witter, *Grand Rapids*; Mrs. Lucina E. DeWolff, *Whitewater*. The Milwaukee delegates were: Dr. Laura R. Wolcott, Mme. Mathilde Franceske Anneke, Mrs. A. M. Bolds, Mrs. A. Flagge, Agnes B. Campbell, Mary A. Rhienart, Matilda Pietsch, N. J. Comstock, Sarah R. Munro, M. D., Juliet H. Severance, M. D., Mrs. Emily Firega, Carl Doerflinger. Maximillian Grossman and Carl Herman Boppe.

Digitized by Google

the course of a long conversation in which it was evident that he had given some thought to the question, he said he would not veto a District of Columbia Woman Suffrage bill, provided such a bill should pass congress, thereby putting himself upon better record than Horace Greely the year of his candidacy, who not only expressed himself as opposed to woman suffrage, but also declared that, if elected, he would veto such a bill provided it passed congress.

Miss Anthony visited James A. Garfield at his home in Mentor, Ohio. He was very cordial, and listened with respect to her presentation of the question. Although from time to time in congress he had uniformly voted with our friends, yet he expressed serious doubts as to the wisdom of pressing this measure during the pending presidential campaign.

As it was deemed desirable to get some expression on paper from the candidates, the following letter, written on official paper, was addressed to the Republican and Democratic nominees:

ROCHESTER, N. Y., August 17, 1880.

Hon. JAMES A. GARFIELD: *Dear Sir:* As vice-president-at-large of the National Woman Suffrage Association, I am instructed to ask you, if, in the event of your election, you, as President of the United States, would recommend to congress, in your message to that body, the submission to the several legislatures of a sixteenth amendment to the national constitution, prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex. What we wish to ascertain is whether you, as president, would use your *official influence* to secure to the women of the several States a *national guarantee* of their right to a voice in the government on the same terms with men. Neither platform makes any pledge to secure political equality to women—hence we are waiting and hoping that one candidate or the other, or both, will declare favorably, and thereby make it possible for women, with self-respect, to work for the success of one or the other or both nominees. Hoping for a prompt and explicit statement, I am, sir, very respectfully yours, SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

To this General Hancock vouchsafed no reply, while General Garfield responded as follows:

MENTOR, O., August 25, 1880.

Dear MISS ANTHONY: Your letter of the 17th inst. came duly to hand. I take the liberty of asking your personal advice before I answer your official letter. I assume that all the traditions and impulses of your life lead you to believe that the Republican party has been and is more nearly in the line of liberty than its antagonist the Democratic party; and I know you desire to advance the cause of woman. Now, in view of the fact that the Republican convention has not discussed your question, do you not think it would be a violation of the trust they have reposed in me, to

Digitized by Google

speak, "as their nominee"—and add to the present contest an issue that they have not authorized? Again, if I answer your question on the ground of my own private opinion, I shall be compelled to say, that while I am open to the freest discussion and fairest consideration of your question, I have not yet reached the conclusion that it would be best for woman and for the country that she should have the suffrage. I may reach it; but whatever time may do to me, that fruit is not yet ripe on my tree. I ask you, therefore, for the sake of your own question, do you think it wise to pick my apples now? Please answer me in the frankness of personal friendship. With kind regards, I am very truly yours,

JAMES A. GARFIELD.

Miss SUSAN B. ANTHONY, Rochester, N. Y.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., September 9, 1880.

Hon. JAMES A. GARFIELD: *Dear Sir:* Yours of the 25th ult. has waited all these days that I might consider and carefully reply.

First. The Republican party did run well for a season in the "line of liberty"; but since 1870, its congressional enactments, majority reports, Supreme Court decisions, and now its presidential platform, show a retrograde movement—not only for women, but for colored men—limiting the power of the national government in the protection of United States citizens against the injustice of the States, until what we gained by the sword is lost by political surrenders. And we need nothing but a Democratic administration to demonstrate to all Israel and the sun the fact, the sad fact, that all *is lost* by the *Republican* party, and not *to be lost* by the *Democratic* party. I mean, of course, the one vital point of national supremacy in the protection of United States citizens in the enjoyment of their right to vote, and the punishment of States or individuals thereof, for depriving citizens of the exercise of that right. The first and fatal mistake was in ceding to the States the right to "abridge or deny" the suffrage to foreign-born men in Rhode Island, and all women throughout the nation, in direct violation of the principle of national supremacy. And from that time, inch by inch, point by point has been surrendered, until it is only in *name* that the Republican party is the party of national supremacy. Grant did not protect the negro's ballot in 1876—Hayes cannot in 1880—nor could Garfield in 1884—for the "sceptre has departed from Judah."

Second. For the candidate of a party to *add* to the discussions of the contest an issue unauthorized or unnoted in its platform, when that issue was one vital to its very life, would, it seems to me, be the grandest act imaginable. And, for doing that very thing, with regard to the protection of the negroes of the South, you are to-day receiving more praise from the best men of the party, than for any and all of your utterances *inside* the line of the platform. And I *know*, if you had in your letter of acceptance, or in your New York speech, declared yourself in favor of "perfect equality of rights for women, civil and political," you would have touched an electric spark that would have fired the heart of the women of the entire nation, and made the triumph of the Republican party more grand and glorious than any it has ever seen.

Third. As to picking fruit before it is ripe! Allow me to remind you that very much fruit is *never* picked; some gets nipped in the blossom; some gets worm-eaten and falls to the ground; some rots on the trees before it ripens; some, too slow in ripening, gets bitten by the early frosts of autumn; while some rich, rare, ripe apples hang unpicked, frozen and worthless on the leafless trees of winter! Really, Mr. Garfield, if, after passing through the war of the rebellion and sixteen years in congress;—if, after seeing, and hearing, and repeating, that *no class* ever got justice and equality of chances from any government except it had the power—the ballot—to clutch them for itself;—if, after all your opportunities for growth and development, you cannot yet see the truth of the great principle of individual self-government;—if you have only reached the idea of class-government, and that, too, of the most hateful and cruel form—bounded by sex—there must be some radical defect in the ethics of the party of which you are the chosen leader.

No matter which party administers the government, women will continue to get only subordinate positions and half-pay, not because of the party's or the president's lack of chivalric regard for woman, but because, in the nature of things, it is impossible for any government to protect a disfranchised class in equality of chances. Women, to get justice, must have political freedom. But pardon this long trespass upon your time and patience, and please bear in mind that it is not for the many *good* things the Republican party and its nominee have done in extending the area of liberty, that I criticise them, but because they have failed to place the women of the nation on the plane of political equality with men. I do not ask you to go beyond your convictions, but I do most earnestly beg you to look at this question from the stand-point of woman—alone, without father, brother, husband, son—battling for bread! It is to help the millions of these unfortunate ones that I plead for the ballot in the hands of all women. With great respect for your frank and candid talk with one of the disfranchised, I am very sincerely yours,

SUSAN B. ANTHONY.

As Mr. Garfield was the only presidential nominee of either of the great parties who deigned a reply to the National Association, we have given his letter an honored place in our history, and desire to pay this tribute to his memory, that while not fully endorsing our claims for political equality he earnestly advocated for woman all possible advantages of education, equal rights in the trades and professions, and equal laws for the protection of her civil rights.

The Thirteenth Annual Washington Convention assembled in Lincoln Hall, January 18, 1881. The first session was devoted to memorial services in honor of Lucretia Mott. A programme *

* 1. Silent Invocation. 2. Music. 3. Eulogy, Elizabeth Cady Stanton. 4. Tributes, Frederick Douglass, Susan B. Anthony. 5. Music. 6. Tributes, Robert Purvis, May Wright Sewall, Phœbe W. Couzins. 7. Closing Hymn—"*Nearer, my God, to Thee.*"

Digitized by Google

for the occasion was extensively circulated, and the response in character and numbers was such an audience as had seldom before crowded that hall. The spacious auditorium was brilliant with sunlight and the gay dresses, red shawls and flowers of the ladies of the fashionable classes. Mrs. Hayes with several of her guests from the White House occupied front seats. The stage was crowded with members of the association, Mrs. Mott's personal friends and wives of members of congress. The decorations which had seldom been surpassed in point of beauty and tastefulness of arrangement, formed a fitting setting for this notable assemblage of women. The background was a mass of colors, formed by the graceful draping of national flags, here and there a streamer of old gold with heavy fringe to give variety, while in the center was a national shield surmounted by two flags. On each side flags draped and festooned, falling at the front of the stage with the folds of the rich maroon curtains. Graceful ferns and foliage plants had been arranged, while on a table stood a large harp formed of beautiful red and white flowers.* At the other end was a stand of hot-house flowers, while in the center, resting on a background of maroon drapery, was a large crayon picture of Lucretia Mott. Above the picture a snow-white dove held in its beak sprays of smilax, trailing down on either side, and below was a sheaf of ripened wheat, typical of the life that had ended. The occasion which had brought the ladies together, the placid features of that kind and well-remembered face, had a solemnizing effect upon all, and quietly the vast audience passed into the hall. The late-comers finding all the seats occupied stood in the rear and sat in the aisles.

Presently Miss Couzins, stepping to the front of the stage said gently, "In accordance with the custom of Mrs. Mott and the time-honored practice of the Quakers, I ask you to unite in an invocation to the Spirit." She bowed her head. The audience followed her example. For several minutes the solemn stillness of devotion pervaded the hall. When Miss Couzins had taken her seat the quartette choir of St. Augustine's church (colored) which was seated on the platform, sang sweetly an appropriate selection, after which Mrs. Stanton delivered the eulogy,† holding

* Of the floral decorations, to which reference is made above as contributing so largely to the handsome appearance of the stage, the harp was furnished through Mr. Wormley in behalf of the colored admirers of Mrs. Mott, and the *epergne* was provided for the occasion by the National Association. There was also a basket of flowers, conspicuous for its beauty, sent in by Senator Cameron of Pennsylvania.

† The eulogy will be found in Volume I., page 407.

Digitized by Google

the rapt attention of her audience over an hour. At the close Frederick Douglass said:

He had listened with interest to the fine analysis of the life and services of Lucretia Mott. He was almost unwilling to have his voice heard after what had been said. He was there to show by his presence his profound respect and earnest love for Lucretia Mott. He recognized none whose services in behalf of his race were equal to hers. Her silence even in that cause was more than the speech of others. He had no words for this occasion.

Robert Purvis at the request of a number of colored citizens of Washington, presented a beautiful floral harp to Mr. Davis, the son-in-law of Lucretia Mott, the only representative of her family present. He paid a tender tribute to the noble woman whose life-long friendship he had enjoyed. Mr. Davis having a seat on the platform, received the gift with evident emotion, and returning thanks, he said:

He would follow the example of Mrs. Mott who seldom kept a gift long, and present these rare flowers to Mrs. Spofford, the treasurer of the Association.

Miss ANTHONY said: The highest tribute she could pay, was, that during the past thirty years she had always felt sure she was right when she had the approval of Lucretia Mott. Next to that of her own conscience she most valued the approval of her sainted friend. And it was now a great satisfaction that in all the differences of opinion as to principles and methods in our movement, Mrs. Mott had stood firmly with the National Association, of which she was to the day of her death the honored and revered vice-president.

Mrs. Sewall, after speaking of the many admirable qualities of Mrs. Mott, said:

In looking around this magnificent audience I cannot help asking myself the question, Where are the young girls? They should be here. It is the birthright of every girl to know the life and deeds of every noble woman. I think Lucretia Mott was as much above the average woman as Abraham Lincoln above the average man.

Miss Couzins closed with a few graceful words. She expressed her pleasure in meeting so magnificent an audience, and thought the whole occasion was a beautiful tribute to one of America's best and noblest women. She hoped the mothers present would carry away the impressions they had received and teach their daughters to hold the name of Lucretia Mott ever in grateful remembrance. The choir sang "Nearer, My God, to Thee." The entire audience arose and joined in the singing, after which they slowly dispersed, feeling that it had indeed been a pentacostal occasion.

Digitized by Google

An able paper from Alexander Dumas, on "Woman Suffrage as a means of Moral Improvement and Prevention of Crime,"* was translated for this meeting by Thomas Mott, the only son of James and Lucretia Mott. This convention continued two days, with the usual number of able speakers.† It was announced at the last session that an effort would be made by Senator McDonald, next day, to call up a resolution providing for the appointment of a standing committee for women; accordingly the ladies' gallery in the Senate was well filled with delegates.

From the *Congressional Record*, January 20, 1881:

Mr. McDonald: On February 16, 1880, I submitted a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee of nine senators, whose duty it shall be to receive, consider and report upon all petitions, memorials, resolutions and bills relating to the rights of women of the United States, said committee to be called "Committee on the Rights of Women." It is on the calendar, and I ask for its present consideration.

The Vice-President (Mr. Wheeler of New York): The senator from Indiana calls up for consideration a resolution on the calendar, which will be reported.

The chief clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of nine senators be appointed by the Senate, whose duty it shall be to receive, consider and report upon all petitions, memorials, resolutions and bills relating to the rights of women of the United States, said committee to be called the Committee on the Rights of Women.

The Vice-President: The question is, Will the Senate agree to the resolution?

Mr. McDonald: Mr. President, it seems to me that the time has arrived when the rights of the class of citizens named in the resolution should have some hearing in the national legislature. We have standing committees upon almost every other subject, but none to which this class of citizens can resort. When their memorials come in they are sometimes sent to the Committee on the Judiciary, sometimes to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and sometimes to other committees. The consequence is that they pass around from committee to committee and never receive any consideration. In the organization and growth of the Senate a number of standing committees have been from time to time created and continued from congress to congress, until many of them have but very little duty now to perform. It seems to me to be very appropriate to consider this question now, and provide some place in the capitol, some room of the Senate, some branch of the government, where this class of applicants can have a full and fair hearing, and have such measures as may be desired to secure to them such rights brought fairly and

* See *National Citizen* of February, 1881.

† Edward M. Davis, Susan B. Anthony, Marilla M. Ricker, Rachel and Julia Foster, Frederick Douglass, Belva A. Lockwood, Robert Purvis, Elizabeth Cady Stanton. This was the first time that Mrs. Martha M'Clellan Brown, Miss Jessie Waite, Mrs. May Wright Sewall and Mrs. Thornton Charles were on our Washington platform. The latter read a poem on woman's sphere.

Digitized by Google

properly before the country. I hope there will be no opposition to the resolution but that it will be adopted by unanimous consent.

Mr. CONKLING: Does the senator from Indiana wish to raise a permanent committee on this subject to take its place and remain on the list of permanent committees?

Mr. MCDONALD: That is precisely what I propose to do.

Mr. CONKLING: Mr. President, I was in hopes that the honorable senator from Indiana, knowing how sincere and earnest he is in this regard, intended that an end should be made soon of this subject; that the prayer of these petitioners should be granted and the whole right established; but now it seems that he wishes to create a perpetual committee, so that it is to go on interminably, from which I infer that he intends that never shall these prayers be granted. I suggest to the senator from Indiana that, if he be in earnest, if he wishes to crown with success this great and beneficent movement, he should raise a special committee, which committee would understand that it was to achieve and conclude its purpose, and this presently, and not postpone indefinitely in the vast forever the realization of this hope. I trust, therefore, that the senator from Indiana will make this a special committee, and will let that special committee understand that before the sun goes down on the last day of this session it is to take final, serious, intelligent action, for which it is to be responsible, whether that action be one way or the other.*

Mr. MCDONALD: The senator from New York misapprehends one purpose of this committee. I certainly have no desire that the rights of this class of our citizens should be deferred to that far-distant future to which he has made reference, nor would this committee so place them. If it be authorized by the Senate, it will be the duty of the committee to receive all petitions, memorials, resolutions and bills relating to the rights of women, not merely presented now but those presented at any future time. It is simply to provide a place where one-half the people of the United States may have a tribunal in this body before which they can have their cases considered. I apprehend that these rights are never to be ended. I do not suppose that the time will ever come in the history of the human race when there will not be rights of women to be considered and passed upon. Therefore, to make this merely a special committee would not accomplish the purpose I had in view. While it would of course give a committee that would receive and hear such petitions as are now presented and consider such bills as should now be brought forward, it would be better to have a committee from term to term, where these same plaints could be heard, the same petitions presented, the same bills considered, and where new rights, whatever they might be, can be dis-

* A standing committee is a permanent one about which no question can be raised in any congress. A special committee is a transient one to be decided upon at the opening of each congress; hence may be at any time voted out of existence. No one understood this better than New York's Stalwart senator, and his plausible manner of killing the measure deceived the very elect. Enough senators were pledged to have carried Mr. McDonald's motion had it been properly understood, but they, as well as some of the ladies in the gallery, were entirely misled by Mr. Conkling's seeming earnest intention to hasten the demands of the women by a short-lived committee, and while those in the gallery applauded, those on the floor defeated the measure they intended to carry.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Jane H. Spofford

Digitized by Google

cussed and acted upon. Therefore I cannot accept the suggestion of the senator from New York to make this a special committee.

Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: I think it a bad idea to raise an extra committee. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules. I think it ought to go there. That is where the rules generally require all such resolutions to be referred.

The VICE-PRESIDENT: The question is on the motion of the senator from Virginia, that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Which was agreed to by a vote of 26 yeas to 23 nays.*

Amid all the pleasure of political excitement the social amenities were not forgotten. A brilliant reception† and supper were given to the delegates by Mrs. Spofford at the Riggs House. During the evening Mrs. Stanton presented the beautiful life-size photograph of Lucretia Mott which had adorned the platform at the convention, to Howard University, and read the following letter from Edward M. Davis:

Mrs. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON—*Dear Madam:* As an expression of my gratitude to the colored people of the District for their beautiful floral tribute to the memory of my dear mother, I desire in the name of her children to present to Howard University the photograph of Lucretia Mott which adorned the platform during the convention. It is a fitting gift to an institution that so well illustrates her principles in opening its doors to all youth without regard to sex or color. With sincere regret that I cannot be present this evening at the reception, I am gratefully yours, EDWARD M. DAVIS.

In receiving the beautiful gift, Dr. Patton, president of the institution, made a graceful response.

In the spring of 1881, the National Association held a series of conventions through New England, beginning with the May anniversary in Boston, of which we give the following description from the *Hartford Courant:*

Among the many anniversaries in Boston the last week in May, one of the most enthusiastic was that of the National Woman Suffrage Association, held in Tremont Temple. The weather was cool and fair and the audience fine throughout, and never was there a better array of speakers at one time on any platform. The number of thoughtful, cultured young women appearing in these conventions, is one of the hopeful features for

* *Yeas*—Messrs. Beck, Booth, Brown, Coke, Davis (W. Va.), Eaton, Edmunds, Farley, Garland, Groome, Hill (Ga.), Harris, Ingalls, Kernan, Lamar, Morgan, Morrill, Pendleton, Platt, Pugh, Ransom, Saulsbury, Slater, Vance, Vest and Withers—26.

Nays—Messrs. Anthony, Blair, Burnside, Butler, Call, Cameron (Pa.), Cameron (Wis.), Conkling, Dawes, Ferry, Hoar, Johnston, Jonas, Kellogg, Logan, McDonald, McMillan, McPherson, Rollins, Saunders, Teller, Williams and Windom—23.

† Of this reception the *National Republican* said: The attractions presented by the fair seekers of the ballot were so much superior to those of the dancing reception going on in the parlors above, that it was almost impossible to form a set of the lanciers until after the gathering in the lower parlors had entirely dispersed.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Jane H Spofford

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R [illegible] L

the success of this movement. The selection of speakers for this occasion had been made at the Washington convention in January, and different topics assigned to each that the same phases of the question might not be treated over and over again.

Mrs. Harriet Hansom Robinson (wife of "Warrington," so long the able correspondent of the *Springfield Republican*), who with her daughter made the arrangements for our reception, gave the address of welcome, to which the president, Mrs. Stanton, replied. Rev. Frederic Hinckley of Providence, spoke on "Unity of Principle in Variety of Method," and showed that while differing on minor points the various woman suffrage associations were all working to one grand end. Anna Garlin Spencer made a few remarks on "The Character of Reformers." Rev. Olympia Brown gave an exceptionally brilliant speech a full hour in length on "Universal Suffrage"; Harriette Robinson Shattuck's theme was "Believing and Doing"; Lillie Devereux Blake's, "Demand for Liberty"; Matilda Joslyn Gage's, "Centralization"; Belva A. Lockwood's, "Woman and the Law". Mary F. Eastman followed showing that woman's path was blocked at every turn, in the professions as well as the trades and the whole world of work; Isabella Beecher Hooker gave an able argument on the "Constitutional Right of Women to Vote"; Martha McLellan Brown spoke equally well on the "Ethics of Sex"; Mrs. Elizabeth Avery Meriwether of Tennessee, gave a most amusing commentary on the spirit of the old common law, cuffing Blackstone and Coke with merciless sarcasm. Mrs. Elizabeth L. Saxon of Louisiana spoke with great effect on "Woman's Intellectual Powers as Developed by the Ballot." These two Southern ladies are alike able, witty and pathetic in their appeals for justice to woman. Mrs. May Wright Sewall's essay on "Domestic Legislation," showing how large a share of the bills passed every year directly effect home life, was very suggestive to those who in answer to our demand for political power, say "Woman's sphere is home," as if the home were beyond the control and influence of the State. Beside all these thoroughly prepared addresses, Susan B Anthony, Dr. Clemence Lozier, Dr. Caroline Winslow, ex-Secretary Lee of Wyoming, spoke briefly on various points suggested by the several speakers.

The white-haired and venerable philosopher, A. Bronson Alcott, was very cordially received, after being presented in complimentary terms by the president. Mr. Alcott paid a glowing tribute to the intellectual worth of woman, spoke of the divinity of her character, and termed her the inspiration font from which his own philosophical ideas had been drawn. Not until the women of our nation have been granted every privilege would the liberty of our republic be assured.* The well-known Francis

* Miss Anthony was presented with a beautiful basket of flowers from Mrs. Mary Hamilton Williams of Fort Wayne, Ind., and returned her thanks. Another interesting incident during the proceedings of the convention was the presentation of an exquisite gold cross from the "Philadelphia Citizens' Suffrage Association," to Miss Anthony. Mrs. Sewall of Indianapolis, in a speech so tender and loving as to bring tears to many eyes, conveyed to her the message and the gift. Miss Anthony's acceptance was equally happy and impressive. As during the last thirty years the press of the country has made Susan B. Anthony a target for more ridicule and abuse than any other woman on the suffrage platform, it is worth noting that all who know her now vie with each other in demonstrations of love and honor.—[E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

W. Bird of Walpole, who has long wielded in the politics of the Bay State, the same power Thurlow Weed did for forty years in New York, being invited to the platform, expressed his entire sympathy with the demand for suffrage, notwithstanding the common opinion held by the leading men of Massachusetts, that the women themselves did not ask it. He recommended State rather than national action.

Rev. Ada C. Bowles of Cambridge, and Rev. Olympia Brown, of Racine, Wis., opened the various sessions with prayer—striking evidence of the growing self-assertion of the sex, and the rapid progress of events towards the full recognition of the fact that woman's hour has come. Touching deeper and tenderer chords in the human soul than words could reach, the inspiring strains of the celebrated organist, Mr. Ryder, rose ever and anon, now soft and plaintive, now full and commanding, mingled in stirring harmony with prayer and speech. And as loving friends had covered the platform with rare and fragrant flowers, the æsthetic taste of the most fastidious artist might have found abundant gratification in the grouping and whole effect of the assemblage in that grand temple. Thus through six prolonged sessions the interest was not only kept up but intensified from day to day.

The National Association was received right royally in Boston. On arriving they found invitations waiting to visit Governor Long at the State House, Mayor Prince at the City Hall, the great establishment of Jordan, Marsh & Co., and the Reformatory Prison for Women at Sherborn. Invitations to take part were extended to woman suffrage speakers in many of the conventions of that anniversary week. Among those who spoke from other platforms, were Matilda Joslyn Gage, Ellen H. Sheldon, Caroline B. Winslow, M. D., editor of *The Alpha*, and Rev. Olympia Brown. The president of the association, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, received many invitations to speak at various points, but had time only for the "Moral Education," "Heredity," and "Free Religious" associations. Her engagement at Parker Memorial Hall, prevented her from accepting the governor's invitation, but Isabella Beecher Hooker and Susan B Anthony led the way to the State house and introduced the delegates from the East, the West, the North and the South, to the honored executive head of the State, who had declared himself, publicly, in favor of woman suffrage. The ceremony of hand-shaking over, and some hundred women being ranged in a double circle about the desk, Mrs. Hooker stepped forward, saying:

Speak a word to us, Governor Long, we need help. Stand here, please, face to face with these earnest women and tell us where help is to come from.

The Governor responded, and then introduced his secretary, who conducted the ladies through the building.

Mrs. HOOKER said: Permit me, sir, to thank you for this unlooked-for and unusual courtesy in the name of our president who should be here to speak for herself and for us, and in the name of these loyal women who ask only that the right of the *people* to govern themselves shall be maintained. In this great courtesy extended us by good old Massachusetts as citizens of this republic unitedly protesting against being taxed without representation, and governed without our consent, we see the beginning of the end—the end of our wearisome warfare—a warfare which though bloodless, has

Digitized by Google

cost more than blood, by as much as soul-suffering exceeds that of mere flesh. I see as did Stephen of old, a celestial form close to that of the Son of Man, and her name is Liberty—always a woman—and she bids us go on—go on—even unto the end.

Miss Anthony standing close to the governor, said in low, pathetic tones:

Yes, we are tired. Sir, we are weary with our work. For forty years some of us have carried this burden, and now, if we might lay it down at the feet of honorable men, such as you, how happy we should be.

The next day Mayor Prince, though suffering from a late severe attack of rheumatism, cordially welcomed the delegates in his room at the City Hall, and chatting familiarly with those who had been at the Cincinnati convention and witnessed his great courtesy, some one remarked that from that time Miss Anthony had proclaimed him the prince among men, and Mrs. Stanton immediately suggested that if the party with which he was identified were wise in their day and generation they would accept his leadership, even to the acknowledgement of the full citizenship of this republic, and thus secure not only their gratitude but their enthusiastic support in the next presidential election. Having compassion upon his Honor because of his manifest physical disability, the ladies soon withdrew and went directly to the house of Jordan, Marsh & Co., where were assembled in a large hall at the top of the building such a crowd of handsome, happy, young girls as one seldom sees in this work-a-day world; that well-known Boston firm within the last six months having fitted up a large recreation room for the use of their employés at the noon hour. Half a hundred girls were merrily dancing to the music of a piano, but ceased in order to listen to words of cheer from Mrs. Lockwood, Mrs. Hooker and Mrs. Sewall. At the close of their remarks Mr. Jordan brought forward a reluctant young girl who could give us, if she would, a charming recitation from "That Lass o' Lowrie's," in return for our kindness in coming to them. And after saying in a whisper to one who kindly urged compliance to this unexpected call, that this had been such a busy day she feared her dress was not all right, her face became unconscious of self in a moment, and with true dramatic instinct, she gave page after page of that wonderful story of the descent into the mine and the recognition there of one whom she loved, precisely as you would desire to hear it were the scene put upon the stage with all the accessories of scenery and companion actors.

From Jordan, Marsh & Co.'s a large delegation proceeded to visit the Reformatory Prison at Sherborn which was established three or four years ago. The board of directors, consisting of three women and two men, has charge of all the prisons of the State. Mrs. Johnson, one of the directors, a noble, benevolent woman, interested in the great charities of Boston, was designated by Governor Long—through whose desire the Association visited the prison—to do the honors and accompany the party from Boston. The officers, matron and physician of the Sherborn prison, are all women. Dr. Mosher, the superintendent, formerly the physician, is a fair, noble-looking woman about thirty-five years of age. She has her own separate house connected with the building.

Digitized by Google

The present physician, a delicate, cultured woman, with sympathy for her suffering charges, is a recent graduate of Ann Arbor.

The entire work is done by the women sent there for restraint, and the prison is nearly self-supporting; it is expected that within another year it will be entirely so. Laundry work is done for the city of Boston, shirts are manufactured, mittens knit, etc. The manufacturing machinery will be increased the coming year. The graded system of reward has been found successful in the development of better traits. It has four divisions, and through it the inmates are enabled to work up by good behavior toward more pleasant surroundings, better clothes and food and greater liberty. From the last grade they reach the freedom of being bound out; of seventy-eight thus bound during the past year but seven were returned. The whole prison, chapel, school-room, dining-room, etc., possesses a sweet, clean, pure atmosphere. The rooms are light, well-ventilated, vines trailing in the windows from which glimpses of green trees and blue sky can be seen.

Added to all the other courtesies, there came the invitation to a few of the representatives of the movement to dine with the Bird Club at the Parker House, in the same cozy room where these astute politicians have held their councils for so many years, and whose walls have echoed to the brave words of many of New England's greatest sons. The only woman who had ever been thus honored before was Mrs. Stanton, who, "escorted by Warrington," dined with these honorable gentlemen in 1871. On this occasion Susan B. Anthony and Harriet H. Robinson accompanied her. Around the table sat several well-known reformers and distinguished members of the press and bar. There was Elizur Wright whose name is a household word in many homes as translator of La Fontaine's fables for the children. Beside him sat the well-known Parker Pillsbury and his nephew, a promising young lawyer in Boston. At one end of the table sat Mr. Bird with Mrs. Stanton on his right and Miss Anthony on his left. At the other end sat Frank Sanborn with Mrs. Robinson (wife of "Warrington") on his right. On either side sat Judge Adam Thayer of Worcester, Charles Field, Williard Phillips of Salem, Colonel Henry Walker of Boston, Mr. Ernst of the Boston *Advertiser*, and Judge Henry Fox of Taunton. The condition of Russia and the Conkling imbroglio in New York; the new version of the Testament and the reason why German Liberals, transplanted to this soil, immediately become conservative and exclusive, were all considered. Carl Schurz, with his narrow ideas of woman's sphere and education, was mentioned by way of example. In reply to the question how the Suffrage Association felt in regard to Conkling's reëlection. Mrs. Robinson said:

> That the leaders, who are students of politics were unitedly against him. Their only hope is in the destruction of the Republican party, which is too old and corrupt to take up any new reform.

Frank Sanborn, fresh from the perusal of the New Testament, asked if women could find any special consolation in the Revised Version regarding everlasting punishment. Mrs. Stanton replied:

Digitized by Google

Certainly, as we are supposed to have brought "original sin" into the world with its fearful forebodings of eternal punishment, any modification of Hades in fact or name, for the *men* of the race, the innocent victims of our disobedience, fills us with satisfaction.

From the club the ladies hastened to the beautiful residence of Mrs. Fenno Tudor, fronting Boston Common, where hundreds of friends had already gathered to do honor to the noble woman so ready to identify herself with the unpopular reforms of her day. Among the many beautiful works of art, a chief attraction was the picture of the grand-mother of Parnell, the Irish agitator, by Gilbert Stuart. The house was fragrant with flowers, and the unassuming manners of Mrs. Tudor, as she moved about among her guests, reflected the glory of our American institutions in giving the world a generation of common-sense women who do not plume themselves on any adventitous circumstances of wealth or position, but bow in respect to morality and intelligence wherever they find it. At the close of the evening Mrs. Stanton presented Mrs. Tudor with the "History of Woman Suffrage" which she received with evident pleasure and returned her sincere thanks.

At the close of the anniversary week in Boston, successful meetings were held in various cities,* beginning at Providence, where Dr. Wm. F. Channing made the arrangements. These conventions were the first that the National Association ever held in the New England States, presenting the national plan of woman's enfranchisement through a sixteenth amendment to the United States Constitution.

---

* PROVIDENCE, R. I.—First Light Infantry Hall, May 30, 31. Rev. Frederick A. Hinckley gave the address of welcome.

PORTLAND, Me.—City Hall, June 2, 3. Rev. Dr. McKeown of the M. E. Church made the address of welcome. Letter read from Dr. Henry C. Garrish. Among the speakers were Charlotte Thomas, A. J. Grover.

DOVER, N. H.—Belknap Street Church, June 3, 4. Marilla M. Ricker took the responsibility of this meeting.

CONCORD, N. H.—White's Opera House, June 4, 5. Speakers entertained by Mrs. Armenia Smith White. Olympia Brown and Miss Anthony spoke before the legislature in Representatives Hall—nearly all the members present—the latter returned on Sunday and spoke on temperance and woman suffrage at the Opera House in the afternoon, Universalist church in the evening.

KEENE, N. H.—Liberty, Hall, June 9, 10. Prayer offered by Rev. Mr. Eakins. Mayor Russell presided and gave the address of welcome.

HARTFORD, Ct.—Unity Hall. June 13, 14. Mrs. Hooker presiding; Frances Ellen Burr, Emily P. Collins, Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford, Caroline Gilkey Rogers, Mary A. Pell taking part in the meetings.

NEW HAVEN, Ct.—Athæneum, June 15, 16. Joseph and Abby Sheldon, Catherine Comstock and others entertained the visitors and speakers.

The speakers who made the entire New England tour were Rev. Olympia Brown, Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Saxon, Mrs. Merlwether, the Misses Foster and Miss Anthony. The arrangements for all these conventions were made by Rachel Foster of Philadelphia.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXX.

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATES AND CONVENTIONS.

1882-1883.

Prolonged Discussions in the Senate on a Special Committee to Look After the Rights of Women, Messrs. Bayard, Morgan and Vest in Opposition—Mr. Hoar Champions the Measure in the Senate, Mr. Reed in the House—Washington Convention—Representative Orth and Senator Saunders on the Woman Suffrage Platform—Hearings Before Select Committees of Senate and House—Reception Given by Mrs. Spofford at the Riggs House—Philadelphia Convention—Mrs. Hannah Whitehall Smith's Dinner—Congratulations from the Central Committee of Great Britain—Majority and Minority Reports in the Senate—Nebraska Campaign—Conventions in Omaha—Joint Resolution Introduced by Hon. John D. White of Kentucky, Referred to the Select Committee—Washington Convention, January 24, 25, 26, 1883—Majority Report in the House.

ALTHOUGH the effort to secure a standing committee on the political rights of women was defeated in the forty-sixth congress, by New York's Stalwart Senator, Roscoe Conkling, motions were made early in the first session of the forty-seventh congress, by Hon. George F. Hoar in the Senate, and Hon. John D. White in the House, for a special committee to look after the interests of women.* It passed by a vote of 115 to 84 in the House, and by 35 to 23 in the Senate. On December 13, 1881, the Senate Committee on Rules reported the following resolution for the appointment of a special committee on woman suffrage:

Resolved, That a select committee of seven senators be appointed by the Chair, to whom shall be referred all petitions, bills and resolves providing for the extension of suffrage to women or the removal of their legal disabilities.

DECEMBER 14.

Mr. HOAR: I move to take up the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules yesterday, for the appointment of a select committee on the subject of woman suffrage.

Mr. VEST: Mr. President, I am constrained to object to the passage of this resolution, and I do it with considerable reluctance. At present we

* During the autumn Miss Anthony, Mrs. Jones, Miss Snow and Miss Couzins, spending some weeks in Washington, asked for an audience with President Chester A. Arthur, and urged him to recommend in his first message to congress the appointment of a standing committee and the submission of a sixteenth amendment.

have thirty standing committees of the Senate; four joint and seven special committees, in addition to the one now proposed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The Chair will inform the senator from Missouri that a majority of the Senate has to decide whether the resolution shall be considered.

Mr. VEST: I understood the Chair to state that it was before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* It is before the Senate if there be no objection. The Chair thought the senator made objection to its consideration.

Mr. HOAR: It went over under the rule yesterday and comes up now.

Mr. EDMUNDS: It is the regular order now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* Certainly. The Chair thought the senator from Missouri objected to its consideration.

Mr. VEST: No, sir.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The resolution is before the Senate and open to debate.

Mr. VEST: I have had the honor for a few years to be a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and my colleagues on that committee will bear witness with me to the trouble and annoyance which at every session have arisen in regard to giving accommodations to the special committees. Two sessions ago there was a conflict between the Senate and House in regard to furnishing committee-rooms for three special committees, and it is only upon the doctrine of *pedis possessio* that the Senate to-day holds three committee-rooms in the capitol, the House still laying claim as a matter of law, through their Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, for the possession of these rooms. At the special session, on account of the exigencies in regard to rooms, we were compelled to take the retiring-room assigned near the gallery to the ladies, and cut it into two rooms, to accommodate select committees.

At this session we have created two special committees more, and I should like to make the inquiry when and where this manufacture of special committees is to cease? As soon as any subject becomes one of comment in the newspapers, or, respectfully I say it, a hobby with certain zealous partisans throughout the country, application is made to the Senate of the United States and a special committee is to be appointed. For this reason, and for the simple reason that a stop must be had somewhere to the raising of special committees, I oppose the proposition now before the Senate.

But, Mr. President, I will be entirely ingenuous and give another reason. This is simply a step toward the recognition of woman suffrage, and I am opposed to it upon principle in its inception. In my judgment it has nothing but mischief in it to the institutions and to the society of this whole country. I do not propose to enter into a discussion of that subject to-day, but it will be proper for me to make this statement, and I make it intending no reflection upon the zealous ladies who have engaged for the past ten years in manufacturing a public sentiment upon this question. I received to-day a letter from a distinguished lady in my

Digitized by Google

own State, for whom I have personally the greatest admiration and respect, calling my attention to the fact that I propose to deny justice to the women of the country. Mr. President, I deny it. It is because I believe that the conservative influence of society in the United States rests with the women of the country that I propose not to degrade the wife and mother to the ward politician, the justice of the peace, or the notary public. It is because I believe honestly that all the best influences for the conservation of society rest upon the women of the country in their proper sphere that I shall oppose this and every other step now and henceforth as violating, as I believe, one of the great essential fundamental laws of nature and of society.

Mr. President, the revenges of nature are sure and unerring, and these revenges are just as certain in political matters and in social matters as in the physical world. Now and here I desire to record once for all my conviction that in this movement to take the women of the country out of their proper sphere of social influence, that great and glorious sphere in which nature and nature's God have placed them, and rush them into the political arena, the attempt is made to put them where they were never intended to be; and I now and here record my opposition to it. This may seem to be but a small matter, but as this letter shows, and I reveal no private confidence, it recognizes the first great step in this reform, as its advocates are pleased to term it. My practice and conviction as a public man is to fight every wrong wherever I believe it to exist. I am opposed to this movement. I am opposed to it upon principle, upon conviction, and I shall call for the yeas and nays in order to record my vote against it.

DECEMBER 15.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules by Mr. Hoar on the 13th inst.

Mr. VEST: Mr. President, I disclaim any intention again to incite or excite any general discussion in regard to woman suffrage. The senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Hoar], for whom I have very great regard, was yesterday pleased to observe that the State governments furnished by the senator from Missouri and other senators in the past had been no argument in favor of manhood suffrage. Mr. President, I have been under the impression that the American people to-day are the best governed, the best clothed, the best fed, the best housed, the happiest people upon the face of the globe, and that, too, notwithstanding the fact that they have been under the domination of the Republican party for twenty long years. I have also been under the impression that the institutions of the States and of the United States are an improvement upon all governmental theories and schemes hitherto known to mortal man; but we are to learn to-day from the senator from Massachusetts that this government and the State governments have been failures, and that woman suffrage must be introduced in order to purify the political atmosphere and elevate the suffrage.

Mr. HOAR: Will the senator allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. VEST: Of course.

Digitized by Google

Mr. HOAR: I desire to disclaim the meaning which the honorable senator seems to have put upon my words. I agree with him that the American governments have been the best on the face of the earth, but it is because of their adoption of that principle of equality more than any other government, the logical effect of which will compel them to yield the right prayed for to women, that they are the best. But still best as they are, I said, and mean to say, that the business of governing mankind has been the one business on the face of the earth which has been done most clumsily, which has been, even where most excellent, full of mistakes, expense, injustice, and wrong-doing. What I said was that I did not think the persons to whom that privileged function had been committed so far were entitled to claim any special superiority for the masculine intellect in the results which it had achieved.

Mr. VEST: To say that the governments, State and national, now in existence upon this continent are imperfect is but to announce the truism that everything made by man is necessarily imperfect. But I stand here to declare to-day that the governments of the States, and the national government, in theory, although failing sometimes in practice, are a standing monument to the genius and intellect of the men who created them. But the senator from Massachusetts was pleased to say further, that woman suffrage should obtain in this country in the interest of education. I permit not that senator to go further than myself in the line of universal public education. I have declared, over and over again, in every county in my State for the past ten years, that universal education should accompany universal suffrage, that the school-house should crown every mound in prairie and forest, that it was the temple of liberty and the altar of law and order.

I well remember that I was thrilled with the eloquence of the distinguished senator from Massachusetts at the last session of the last congress, when, upon a bill to provide for general education by a donation of the public lands, he so pathetically and justly described the mass of dark ignorance and illiteracy projected upon the people of the South under the policy of the Republican party, and the senator then stood here and said that the people of Massachusetts extended the public lands to relieve the people of the South from this monstrous burden. What does the senator propose to do to-day? He proposes with one stroke of the pen to double, and more than double, the illiterate suffrage of the United States. The senator says that one-half the people of the United States are represented in this measure of woman suffrage. I deny it, sir. If the senator means that the women of America, comprising one-half of the population, are interested in this measure, I deny it most emphatically and most peremptorily. Not one-tenth of them want it. Not one-tenth of the mothers and sisters and Christian women of this land want to be turned into polititians or to meddle in a sphere to which God and nature have not assigned them.

Sir, there are some ladies—and I do not intend to term them anything but ladies—who are zealously engaged in this cause, and they have flooded this hall with petitions, and have called their women's rights conventions

Digitized by Google

all over the land. I assail not their motives, but I deny that they represent the women of the United States. I say that if woman suffrage obtains, the worst class of the women of the country will rush to the polls and the best class will remain away by a large majority. That is my deliberate judgment and firm conviction. But, Mr. President, a word in regard to the committees. I desire no general discussion upon woman suffrage, and simply alluded in passing to what had been said by the senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The hour of one o'clock has arrived, and the morning hour is closed.

DECEMBER 16.

Mr. JONES of Florida: I desire to call up a resolution now lying on the table, which I introduced on the 14th instant, calling for information from the Secretary of War touching a ship-canal across the peninsula of Florida.

Mr. HOAR: Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The senator from Florida asks leave to call up a resolution submitted by him.

Mr. HOAR: My resolution was before the Senate yesterday, and comes up in order. I hope we shall vote on it.

Mr. JONES of Florida: I will only say that my resolution was laid over temporarily on the objection of the senator from Vermont [Mr. Edmunds], which he will not insist upon.

Mr. HOAR: Allow me to call the attention of the Chair to the fact; it is not the question of a resolution which has not been taken up. The resolution reported by me from the Committee on Rules was taken up, and was under discussion when the senator from Missouri [Mr. Vest] was taken from the floor by the expiration of the morning hour, in the midst of his remarks. Certainly his right to conclude his remarks takes precedence of other business under the usual practice of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The Chair thought the senator from Missouri had ended his remarks, or he would not have interposed when he did.

Mr. HOAR: No, sir.

Mr. JONES of Florida: My resolution involves no debate. It is merely a resolution of inquiry.

Mr. HOAR: The other will be disposed of, I hope, in a few moments.

Mr. JONES of Florida: The resolution to which I refer went over informally on the objection of the senator from Vermont, and I think he has no objection now.

Mr. HOAR: The other will be disposed of in a moment, and I hope we shall vote on it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Hoar].

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules by Mr. Hoar on the 13th instant.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The Chair would state to the senator from Missouri [Mr. Vest] that the Chair supposed yesterday that he had fin-

Digitized by Google

ished his remarks, or the Chair would not have stopped him at that moment. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, on which the senator from Missouri [Mr. Vest] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. VEST: Mr. President, I was on the eve of finishing my remarks yesterday when the morning hour expired, and I do not now wish to detain the Senate. I was about to say at that time that the Senate now has forty-one committees, with a small army of messengers and clerks, one-half of whom, without exaggeration, are literally without employment. I shall not pretend to specify the committees of this body which have not one single bill, resolution, or proposition of any sort pending before them, and have not had for months. I am very well aware that if I should name one of them, Liberty would lie bleeding in the streets at once, and that committee would become the most important on the list of committees of the Senate. I shall not venture to do that. I am informed by the Sergeant-at-arms that if this resolution is adopted he must have six additional messengers to be added to that body of ornamental employés who now stand or sit at the doors of the respective committee-rooms. I have heard that this committee is for the purpose of giving a committee to a senator in this body. I have heard the statement made, but I cannot believe it, and I am very certain that no senator will undertake to champion the resolution upon any such ground.

The senator from Massachusetts was pleased to say that the Committee on the Judiciary had so many important questions pending before it, that the subject of woman suffrage should not be added to them. The Committee on Territories is open to any complaint or suggestion by the ladies who advocate woman suffrage, in regard to this subject in the territories; and the Committee on Privileges and Elections to which this subject should go most appropriately, as affecting the suffrage, has not now before it, as I am informed, one single bill, resolution, or proposition of any sort whatever. That committee is also open to inquiry upon this subject.

But, Mr. President, out of all committees without business, and habitually without business, in this body, there is one that beyond any question could take jurisdiction of this matter and do it ample justice. I refer to that most respectable and antique institution, the Committee on Revolutionary Claims. For thirty years it has been without business. For thirty long years the placid surface of that parliamentary sea has been without one single ripple. If the senator from Massachusetts desires a tribunal for calm judicial equilibrium and examination, a tribunal far from the "madding crowd's ignoble strife," a tribunal eminently respectable, dignified and unique, why not send this question to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims? When I name the *personnel* of that committee it will be evident that any consideration on any subject touching the female sex would receive not only deliberate but immediate attention, for the second member upon that committee is my distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. Jones], and who can doubt that he would give his undivided attention to the subject? [Laughter.] It is eminently proper that this subject should go to that committee because if there is any revolutionary claim in this country it is that of woman suffrage. [Laughter.] It revo-

Digitized by Google

lutionizes society; it revolutionizes religion; it revolutionizes the constitution and laws; and it revolutionizes the opinions of those so old-fashioned among us as to believe that the legitimate and proper sphere of woman is the family circle as wife and mother and not as politician and voter—those of us who are proud to believe that—

> A woman's noblest station is retreat;
> Her fairest virtues fly from public sight;
> Domestic worth—that shuns too strong a light.

Before that Committee on Revolutionary Claims why could not this most revolutionary of all claims receive immediate and ample attention? More than that, as I said before, if there is any tribunal that could give undivided time and dignified attention, is it not this committee? If there is one peaceful haven of rest, never disturbed by any profane bill or resolution of any sort, it is the Committee on Revolutionary Claims. It is, in parliamentary life, described by that ecstatic verse in Watts' hymn:

> There shall I bathe my wearied soul
> In seas of endless rest,
> And not one wave of trouble roll
> Across my peaceful breast.

For thirty years there has been no excitement in that committee, and it needs to-day, in Western phrase, some "stirring-up." By all natural laws stagnation breeds disease and death; and what could stir up this most venerable and respectable institution more than an application of the strong-minded, with short hair and shorter skirts, invading its dignified realm and elucidating all the excellences of female suffrage? Moreover, if these ladies could ever succeed, in the providence of God, in obtaining a report from that committee, it would end this question forever; for the public at large and myself included, in view of that miracle of female blandishment and female influence, would surrender at once, and female suffrage would become constitutional and lawful. Sir, I insist upon it that in deference to this committee, in deference to the fact that it needs this sort of regimen and medicine, this whole subject should be so referred. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORRILL: Mr. President, I do not desire to say anything as to the merits of the resolution, but I understand the sole purpose of raising this committee is to have a committee-room. So far as I know, there are some five or six committees now which are destitute of rooms, and it would be impossible for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to assign any room to this committee—the object which I understand is at the foundation of the introduction of the proposition; that is to say, to give these ladies an opportunity to be heard in some appropriate committee-room on the questions which they wish to agitate and submit.

Mr. HOAR: They would find room in some other committee-room. They could have the room of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, if there were no other place.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The question is on the adoption of the resolution reported by the senator from Massachusetts.

Digitized by Google

Mr. HARRIS: Did not the senator from Missouri [Mr. Vest] offer an amendment?

Mr. GARLAND: As I understand, he moved to refer the subject to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* Does the Chair understand that the senator from Missouri has offered an amendment?

Mr. VEST: Yes, sir; I move to refer the matter to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

Mr. CONGER: Let the resolution be reported.

The acting secretary read the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The senator from Missouri offers an amendment, that the subject be referred to the standing Committee on Revolutionary Claims. The question is on the amendment of the senator from Missouri. [Putting the question.] The noes appear to have it.

Mr. FARLEY called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered and taken.

Mr. BLAIR [after having voted in the negative]: I have voted inadvertently. I am paired with the senator from Alabama [Mr. Pugh]. Were he present he would have voted "yea," as I have voted "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. WINDOM: I am paired with the senator from West Virginia [Mr. Davis], but as I understand he would vote "nay" on this question, I vote "nay."

Mr. INGALLS: I am paired with the senator from Mississippi [Mr. Lamar].

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 31. So the motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The question recurs on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BAYARD: Is it in order for me to move the reference of the subject to the Committee on the Judiciary?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* It is in order to move to refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Chair understands.

Mr. BAYARD: Then I make a motion that the resolution be sent to the Committee on the Judiciary. I would state that I voted with some regret and hesitancy upon the motion of the senator from Missouri [Mr. Vest] to refer this matter to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims. My regret was owing to the fact that I do not wish even to seem to treat a subject of this character in a spirit of levity, or to indicate the slightest disrespect by such a reference, to those whose opinions upon this subject differ essentially from my own. I cast the vote because I considered it would be taking the subject virtually away from the consideration of congress at its present session. I do, however, hold that there is no necessity for the creation of a special committee to attend to this subject. The Committee on the Judiciary has within the last few years, upon many occasions, attempted to deal with it. Since you, sir, and I have been members of that committee—

Mr. HOAR: Mr. President—

Digitized by Google

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* Will the senator from Delaware yield to the senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BAYARD: I will, if he thinks it necessary to interrupt me.

Mr. HOAR: I desire to ask the senator, if he is willing, having been lately a member of the committee to which he refers, whether it is not the rule of that committee to allow no hearings to individual petitioners, a rule which is departed from only in very rare and peculiar cases?

Mr. BAYARD: I will reply to the honorable senator that the occasion which arose to my mind and caused me to remember the action of that committee was the audience given by it to a very large delegation of woman suffragists, *to wit*, the representatives of a convention held in this city, who to the number, I think, of twenty-five, came into the committee-room of the Committee on the Judiciary, and were heard, as I remember, for more than one day, or certainly had more than one hearing, before that committee, of which you, sir, and I were members.

Mr. HOAR: If the senator will pardon me, however, he has not answered my question. I asked the senator not whether on one particular occasion they gave a hearing on this subject, but whether it is not the rule of that committee, occasioned by the necessity of its business, from which it departs only in very rare cases, not to give hearings?

Mr. BAYARD: I cannot answer whether a rule so defined as that suggested by the honorable senator from Massachusetts exists in that committee. It is my impression, however, that cases are frequently, by order of that committee, argued before it. We have had very elaborate and able arguments upon subjects connected with the Pacific railroads, I remember; and we have had arguments upon various subjects. It is constantly our pleasure to hear members of the Senate upon a variety of questions before that committee. It may be only a proof that women's rights are not unrecognized nor their influence unfelt when I state the fact that if there be such a rule as is suggested by the honorable senator from Massachusetts of excluding persons from the audience of that committee, on the occasion of the application of the ladies a hearing was granted, and they came in force,—not only force in numbers, but force in the character and intelligence of those who appeared before the committee. They were listened to with great respect, but their views were not concurred in by the committee as it was then composed. We were all entertained by the bright wit, the clever and, in my judgment, in many respects, the just sarcasm of our honorable friend from Missouri [Mr. Vest], but my habit is not to consider public measures in a jocular light; it is not to consider a question of this kind in a jocular light. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of this proposition, whatever may be the reasons for or against it, no man can doubt that it will strike at the very roots of the present organization of society, and that its consequences will be most profound and far-reaching should the advocates of the measure proposed prevail.

Therefore it is that I think this subject should not be considered separately; it should not have a special committee—either of advocates or opponents arranged for its consideration; but it should go where proposed amendments to the fundamental law of the land have always been sent for

Digitized by Google

consideration,—to that committee to which judicial questions, questions of a constitutional nature, have always in the history of this government been committed. There is no need, there is no justice, there is no wisdom in attempting to separate the fate of this question, which affects society so profoundly and generally, from the other questions that affect society. It cannot be made a specialty; it ought not to be. You cannot tear this question from the great contest of human passions, affections, and interests which surround it, and treat it as a thing by itself. It has many sides from which it may be viewed, some that are not proper or fitting for this forum, and a discussion now in public. There are the claims of religion itself to be considered in connection with this case. Civil rights, social rights, political rights, religious rights, all are bound up in the consideration of a measure like this. In its consideration you cannot safely attempt to segregate this question and leave it untouched and uninfluenced by all those other questions by which it is surrounded and in the consideration of which it is bound to be connected and concerned. Therefore, without going further, prematurely, into a discussion of the merits of the proposition itself or its desirability, I say that it should take the usual course which the practice and laws of this body have given to grave public questions. Let it go to the Committee on the Judiciary, and let them, under their sense of duty, deal with it according to its gravity and importance, and if it be here returned let it be passed upon by the grave deliberations of the Senate itself. I hope the special committee proposed will not be raised, and I trust the Senate will concur with me in thinking that the subject should be sent to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LOGAN rose.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The morning hour has expired.

Mr. LOGAN: I want to say just one word.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* It requires unanimous consent.

Mr. LOGAN: I do not wish to make a speech; I merely desire to say a word in response to what the senator from Delaware [Mr. Bayard] has said in relation to the reference to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HARRIS: I ask unanimous consent that the senator from Illinois may proceed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* There being no objection unanimous consent will be presumed to have been given for the senator from Illinois to make his explanation.

Mr. LOGAN: This question having been once before the Judiciary Committee, and it being a request by many ladies, who are citizens of the United States just as we are, that they should have a special committee of the Senate before which they can be heard, I deem it proper and right, without any committal whatever in reference to my own views, that they should have that committee. It is nothing but fair, just, and right that they should have a committee organized as nearly as can be in the Senate in favor of the views they desire to present. It is treating them only as other citizens would desire to be treated before a body of this character. I am, therefore, opposed to the reference of the proposition to the Judiciary Committee, and I hope the Senate will give these ladies a special committee

Digitized by Google

where they can be heard, and that that committee may be so organized as that it will be as favorable to their views as possible, so that they may have a fair hearing. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. MORRILL: I hope this subject will be concluded this morning, otherwise it is to come up constantly and monopolize all the time of the morning hour. I do not think it will require many minutes more to dispose of it now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The Chair will entertain a motion on that subject.

Mr. MORRILL: I move to set aside other business until this resolution shall be disposed of. If it should continue any length of time of course I would withdraw the suggestion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The senator from Vermont——

Mr. VOORHEES: Mr. President, I feel constrained to call for the regular order.

DECEMBER 19. 1881.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* Are there further "concurrent or other resolutions"?

Mr. HOAR: I call up the resolution in regard to woman suffrage, reported by me from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. JONES of Florida: I ask for information how long the morning hour is to extend?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The regular business of the morning hour is closed. The morning hour, however, will not expire until twenty minutes past one. The senator from Massachusetts asks to have taken up the resolution reported by him from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HOAR: I hope we may have a vote on the resolution this morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The question is on the amendment proposed by the senator from Delaware [Mr. Bayard], that the subject be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR: It is not intended by the resolution to commit the Senate or any senator in the slightest degree to any opinion upon the question of woman suffrage, but it is merely the question of a convenient mode of hearing. I hope we shall be allowed to have a vote on the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* Is the Senate ready for the question on the motion of the senator from Delaware?

Mr. BAYARD and Mr. FARLEY called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. BECK: Mr. President, I have received a number of communications from very respectable ladies in my own State upon this important question; but I am unable to comply with their request and support the female suffrage which they advocate. I shall vote for the reference to the Committee on the Judiciary in order that there may be a thorough investigation of the question. I wholly disagree with the suggestion of the senator from Illinois [Mr. Logan], that a committee ought to be appointed as favorable to the views of these ladies as possible. I desire a committee that will have no views, for or against them. except what is best for the public good. Such a committee I understand the Committee on the Judiciary to be.

Digitized by Google

I desire to say only in a word that the difficulty I have and the question I desire the Committee on the Judiciary to report upon is, the effect of this question upon suffrage. By the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States there can be no discrimination made in regard to voting on account of race, color or previous condition. Intelligence is properly regarded as one of the fundamental principles of fair suffrage. We have been compelled in the last ten years to allow all the colored men of the South to become voters. There is a mass of ignorance there to be absorbed that will take years and years of care in order to bring that class up to the standard of intelligent voters. The several States are addressing themselves to that task as earnestly as possible. Now it is proposed that all the women of the country shall vote; that all the colored women of the South, who are as much more ignorant than the colored men as it is possible to imagine, shall vote. Not one perhaps in a hundred of them can read or write. The colored men have had the advantages of communication with other men in a variety of forms. Many of them have considerable intelligence; but the colored women have not had equal chances. Take them from their wash-tubs and their household work and they are absolutely ignorant of the new duties of voting citizens. The intelligent ladies of the North and the West and the South cannot vote without extending that privilege to that class of ignorant colored people. I doubt whether any man will say that it is safe for the republic now, when we are going through the problem we are obliged to solve, to fling in this additional mass of ignorance upon the suffrage of the country. Why, sir, a rich corporation or a body of men of wealth could buy them up for fifty cents apiece, and they would vote without knowing what they were doing for the side that paid most. Yet we are asked to confer suffrage upon them, and to have a committee appointed as favorable to that view as possible, so as to get a favorable report upon it!

I want the Committee on the Judiciary to tell the congress and the country whether they think it is good policy now to confer suffrage on all the colored women of the South, ignorant as they are known to be, and thus add to the ignorance that we are now struggling with, and whether the republic can be sustained upon such a basis as that. For that reason, and because I want that information from an unbiased committee, because I know that suffrage has been degraded sufficiently already, and because it would be degraded infinitely more if a report favorable to this extension of suffrage should be adopted and passed through congress, I am opposed to this movement. No matter if there are a number of respectable ladies who are competent to vote and desire it to be done, because of the very fact that they cannot be allowed this privilege without giving all the mass of ignorant colored women in the country the right to vote, thus bringing in a mass of ignorance that would crush and degrade the suffrage of this country almost beyond conception, I shall vote to refer the subject to the Judiciary Committee, and I shall await their report with a good deal of anxiety.

Mr. MORGAN: Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The morning hour has expired, and the unfinished business is before the Senate.

DECEMBER 20, 1881.

Mr. HOAR: I now call up the resolution for appointing a special committee on woman suffrage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The morning hour having expired, the senator from Massachusetts calls up the resolution which was under consideration yesterday.

Mr. INGALLS: What is the regular order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* There is no regular unfinished business. The senator from Florida [Mr. Call] gave notice yesterday that he would ask the indulgence of the Senate to-day to consider the subject of homestead rights.

Mr. HOAR: I hope this matter may be disposed of. It is very unpleasant to me to stand before the Senate in this way, taking up its time with this matter in a five minutes' debate every day in succession for an unlimited period of time. It is a matter which every senator understands. It has nothing to do with the merits of the woman suffrage question at all. It is a mere desire on the part of these people to have a particular form of hearing, which seems to me the most convenient for the Senate, and I hope the Senate will be willing to vote on the resolution and let it pass.

Mr. MORGAN: I have no objection to proceeding to the consideration of the resolution, but I desire to address the Senate upon it.

Mr. HOAR: I think I must ask now as a favor of the senator from Alabama that he let the resolution be disposed of promptly.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The senator from Alabama states that he has no objection to the present consideration of the resolution, but he asks leave to make some remarks upon it. The Chair hearing no objection to the consideration of the resolution, it is before the Senate.

Mr. FARLEY: I object to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HOAR: I move to take it up.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The senator from Massachusetts calls it up as a matter of right. If a majority of the Senate agree to take up the resolution it is before the Senate, and the Chair will put the question. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the senator from Massachusetts to proceed to the consideration of the resolution. [The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules by Mr. Hoar on the 13th instant, which was read.]

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The pending question is on the motion of the senator from Delaware [Mr. Bayard] to refer the subject to the Committee on the Judiciary, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MORGAN: Mr. President, I stand in a different relation to this question from that of the senator from Kentucky [Mr. Beck], who said yesterday that he had received a number of communications from very respectable ladies in his own State upon this very important subject, and yet felt constrained by a sense of duty to deny the action which they solicited at

Digitized by Google

the hands of congress. I am not informed that any woman from Alabama has ever sent a petition to the Senate, or to either house, upon this matter. Indeed, it is my impression that no petitions or letters have ever been addressed by any lady in the State of Alabama to either house of congress upon this question. It may be that that peculiar type of civilization which drives women from their homes to the ballot-box to seek redress and protection against their husbands has never yet reached the State of Alabama, and I shall not be disagreeably disappointed if it should never come upon our people, for they have lived in harmony and in prosperity now for many years. Besides the relief which the State has seen proper to give to married women in respect of their separate estates, we have not thought it wise or politic in any sense to go further and undertake to make a line of demarkation between the husband and wife as politicians. On the contrary, according to our estimate of a proper civilization, we look to the family relation as being the true foundation of our republican institutions. Strike out the family relation, disband the family, destroy the proper authority of the person at the head of the family, either the wife or the husband, and you take from popular government all legitimate foundation.

The measure which is now brought before the Senate of the United States is but the initial measure of a series which has been urged upon the attention of States and territories, and upon the attention of the Congress of the United States in various forms to draw a line of political demarkation through a man's household, through his fireside, and to open to the intrusion of politics and politicians that sacred circle of the family where no man should be permitted to intrude without the consent of both the heads of the family. What picture could be more disagreeable or more disgusting than to have a pot-house politician introduce himself into a gentleman's family, with his wife seated at one side of the fireplace and himself at the other, and this man coming between to urge arguments why the wife should oppose the policy that the husband advocates, or that the husband should oppose the policy that the wife advocates?

If this measure means anything it is a proposition that the Senate of the United States shall first vote to carry into effect this unjust and improper intrusion into the home circle. Suppose this resolution to raise a select committee should be passed: that committee will have its hands full and its ears full of petitions and applications and speeches from strong-minded women, and of course it must make some report to the Senate; and we shall have this subject introduced in here as one that requires a peculiar application of the powers of the Senate for its digestion and for the completion of the bills and measures founded upon it. At the next session of congress this select committee will become a standing committee of the Senate, and then we shall have that which appears to be the most potential and at the same time the most dangerous element in politics to-day, agitation, agitation, agitation. It seems that the legislators of the United States Government are not to be allowed to pass in quiet judgment upon measures of this character, but like many other things which are addressing themselves to the attention of the people on this side of the water and the other, they must all be moved against the Senate and against the House

Digitized by Google

by agitation. You raise your committee and allow the agitators to come before them, yea, more than that, you invite them to come; and what is the result? The Congress of the United States will for the next ten or perhaps twenty years be continually assailed for special and peculiar legislation in favor of the women of the land.

I do not understand that a woman in this country has any more right to a select committee than a man has. It would be just as rational and as proper in every legislative and parliamentary sense to have a select committee for the consideration of the rights of men as to have a committee for the consideration of the rights of women. I object, sir, to this disseverance between the sexes, and I object to the Senate of the United States giving its sanction in advance or in any way to this character of legislation. It is a false principle, and it will work evil, and only evil, in this country.

What jurisdiction do you expect to exercise in the Senate of the United States for the benefit of the women in respect of suffrage or in respect of separate estates? Where are the boundaries of your jurisdiction? You find them in the territories and in the District of Columbia. If you expect to proceed into the States you must have the Constitution of the United States amended so as to put our wives and our daughters upon the footing of those who are provided for in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. Your jurisdiction is limited to the territories and to the District of Columbia.

Inasmuch as this measure, I understand, has been made a party measure by the decree of a caucus, I propose to make some little inquiry into the past legislation of the Congress of the United States under Republican rule in respect of the extension of the right of suffrage to certain classes of people in this country. I will take up first the territories.

Let us look for a moment at the result of woman suffrage in some of the territories. The territorial legislature of Utah has gone forward and conferred the right of suffrage upon women. The population in the last decade has reached from 64,000, I believe, to about 150,000. The territorial legislature of Utah conferred upon the females of that territory the right of suffrage, and how have they exercised that right? Sir, I am ashamed to say it, but it is known to the world that the power of Mormonism and polygamy in Utah territory is sustained by female suffrage. You cannot get rid of those laws. Ninety per cent. of the legislative power of Utah territory is Mormon and polygamous. If female suffrage is to be incorporated into the laws of our country with a view to the amelioration of our morals or our political sentiments, we stand aghast at the spectacle of what has been wrought by its exercise in the territory of Utah. There stands a power supporting the crime of polygamy through what they call a divine inspiration, or teaching from God, and all the power of the judges of the United States and of the Congress of the United States has been unavailing to break it down. Who have upheld it? Those who in the family circle represent one husband to fifteen women. A continual accumulation of the power of the church and of polygamy is going on, and when the Gentiles, as they are called, enter that territory with the view of breaking it up they are confronted by the women, who

are allowed to vote, and from whom we should naturally expect a better and a higher morality in reference to subjects of the kind. But this only shows the power of man over woman. It only shows how through her tender affections, her delicate sensibilities, and her confiding spirit she can be made the very slave and bond-servant of man, and can scarcely ever be made an independent participant in the stronger exercise of the powers which God seems to have intrusted to him. Never was there a picture more disgusting or more condemnatory of the extension of the franchise to women as contradistinguished from men than is presented in the territory of Utah to-day.

Where is the necessity of raising the number of voters in the United States from 10,000,000 to 20,000,000? That would be the direct effect of conferring suffrage upon the women, for they are at least one-half, if not a little more than one-half, of the entire population of the country above the age of twenty-one. We have now masses of voters so enormous in numbers as that it seems to be almost beyond the power of the law to execute the purposes of the elective franchise with justice, with propriety, and without crime. How much would these difficulties and these intrinsic troubles be increased if we should raise the number of voters from 10,000,000 to 20,000,000 in the United States? That would be the direct and immediate effect of conferring the franchise upon the women. What would be the next effect of such an extension of the suffrage? It was described by my friend from Missouri [Mr. Vest] and by other senators who have spoken upon this subject. The effect would be to drive the ladies of the land, as they are termed, the well-bred and well-educated women, the women of nice sensibilities, within their home circle, there to remain, while the ruder of that sex would thrust themselves out on the hustings and at the ballot-box, and fight their way to the polls through negroes and others who are not the best of company even at the polls, to say nothing of the disgrace of association with them. You would paralyze one-third at least of the women of this land by the very vulgarity of the overture made to them that they should go struggling to the polls in order to vote in common with the herd of men. They would not undertake it. The most intelligent and trustworthy part of the suffrage thus placed upon the land would never be available, while that which was not worthy of respect either for its character or for its information would take the matter in hand and move along in the circle of politicians to cast their suffrages at the ballot-box.

As the States to be formed out of the territories are admitted into the Union, they will come stamped with the characteristics which the legislatures of the territories have imprinted upon them; and if after due consideration in those territories the men who have the regulation of public affairs should come to the conclusion that it was best to have woman suffrage, then we can allow them, under existing laws, to go on and perfect their systems and apply for admission into the Union with them as they may choose to adopt them and to shape them. The law upon that subject as it exists is liberal enough, for it gives to the legislatures the right to regulate the qualifications of suffrage. It leaves it to each local

community, wherever it may be throughout the territories of the United States, to determine for itself what it may prefer to have.

Is it the object in the raising of this committeee only that it shall have so many speeches made, so much talk about it, or is it to be the object of the committee to have legislation brought here? If you bring legislation here, what will you bring? An amendment to the constitution like the fourteenth amendment, or else some provision obligatory upon the territories by which female suffrage shall be allowed there, whether the people want it or whether they do not? For my part, before this session of congress ends I intend to introduce a bill to repeal woman suffrage in the territory of Utah, knowing and believing that that will be the most effectual remedy for the extirpation of polygamy in that unfortunate territory. If you choose to repeal the laws of any territory conferring the right of suffrage upon women you have the power in congress to do it; but there are no measures introduced here and none advocated in that direction. The whole drift of this movement is in the other direction. This committee is sought to be raised either for the accommodation of some senator who wants a chairmanship and a clerk, or it is sought to be raised for the purpose of encouraging a raid on the laws and traditions of this country, which I think would end in our total demoralization. I therefore oppose this measure in the beginning, and I expect to oppose it as far as it may go.

Now let us notice for a moment the case of the District of Columbia. There are some senators here who have given themselves a great deal of trouble in the advocacy of the right of suffrage of the people of the United States, and especially of the colored people. They put themselves to great trouble, and doubtless at some expense of feeling, to worry and beset and harry gentlemen who come from certain States of this Union, in reference to the votes of the negroes: and yet these very gentlemen have been either in this House or in the other when the Republican party has had a two-thirds majority of both branches and has deliberately taken from the people of the District of Columbia the right to elect any officer from a constable to a mayor, all because when the experiment was tried here it was found that the negroes were a little too strong. There was too much African suffrage in the ballot-box, and they must get rid of it, and to get rid of it on terms of equality they have disfranchised every man in the District of Columbia.

I shall have more faith in the sincerity of the declarations of gentlemen of their desire to have the women vote when I see that they have made some step toward the restoration of the right of suffrage to the people of the District of Columbia. While they let this blot remain upon our law, while they allow this damning conviction to stand, they may stare us in the face and accuse us continually of a want of candor and sincerity on this subject, but they will address their arguments to me in vain, even as coming from men who have an infatuation upon the subject. I do not believe a word of it, Mr. President.

I cannot be convinced against these facts that this new movement in favor of female suffrage means anything more than to add another patch

Digitized by Google

to the worn-out garment of Republicanism, which they patched with Mahoneism in Virginia, with repudiation elsewhere, and which they now seek to patch further by putting on the delicate little silk covering of woman suffrage. I do not believe that this movement has its root and branch in any sincere desire to give to the women of this land the right of suffrage. I think it is a mere party movement with a view of attempting to draw into the reach of the Republican party some little support from the sympathy and interest they suppose the ladies will take in their cause if they should advocate it here. No bill, perhaps, is expected to be reported. The committee will sit and listen and profess to be charmed and enlightened and instructed by what may be said, and then the subject will be passed by without any actual effort to secure the passage of a bill.

Introduce your bills and let them go to the Judiciary Committee, where the rights of men are to be considered as well as the rights of women. If this subject is of that pressing national importance which senators seem to think it is, it is not to be supposed that the Committee on the Judiciary will fail to give it profound and early attention. When you bring a select committee forward under the circumstances under which this is to be raised, you must not expect us to give credit generally to the idea that the real purpose is to advance the cause of woman suffrage, but rather that the real purpose is to advance the cause of political domination in this country. I can see no reason for the raising of this select committee, unless it be to furnish some senator, as I have remarked, with a clerk and messenger. If that were the avowed reason or could even be intimated, I think I should be disposed to yield that courtesy to the senator, whoever he might be; but I cannot do it under the false pretext that the real object is to bring forward measures here for the introduction of woman suffrage into the District of Columbia, where we have no suffrage, or into the territories, where they have all the suffrage that the territorial legislatures see proper to give them. I therefore shall oppose the resolution.

Mr. BAYARD: I move the that Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. [The motion was agreed to.]

JANUARY 9, 1882.

Mr. HOAR: I now ask for the consideration of the resolution relating to a select committee on woman suffrage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* There being ten minutes left of the morning hour, the senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Hoar] asks for the consideration of the resolution relating to woman suffrage. The pending question is on the motion of the senator from Delaware [Mr. Bayard] to refer the subject-matter to the Committee on the Judiciary, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The principal legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when Mr. Pugh's name was called): I was requested by the senator from Alabama [Mr. Pugh] to announce his pair with the senator from New York [Mr. Miller].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. TELLER: On this question I am paired with the senator from Alabama [Mr. Morgan]. If the senator from Alabama were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McPHERSON (after having voted in the affirmative): I rise to ask the privilege of withdrawing my vote. I am paired with my colleague [Mr. Sewell] on all political questions, and this seems to have taken a political shape.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The senator from New Jersey withdraws his vote.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 31. So the motion was not agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The question recurs on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. EDMUNDS: Let it be read for information. The secretary read the resolution.

Mr. EDMUNDS: "Shall" ought to be stricken out and "may" inserted, because the Senate ought always to have the power to refer any particular measure as it pleases.

Mr. HOAR: I have no objection to that modification.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The senator from Massachusetts accepts the suggestion of the senator from Vermont, and the word "may" will be substituted for "shall."

Mr. HILL of Georgia: I wish to say that I have opposed all resolutions, whether originating on the other side of the chamber or on this side, appointing special committees. They are all wrong. They are not founded, in my judgment, on a correct principle. There is no necessity to raise a select committee for this business. The standing committees of the Senate are ample to do everything that it is proposed the select committee asked for shall do. The only result of appointing more special committees is to have just that many more clerks, just that much more expense, just that many more committee-rooms. This is not the first time I have opposed the raising of a select committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The morning hour has expired, and it requires unanimous consent for the senator from Georgia to proceed with his remarks.

JANUARY 21, 1882.

Mr. HOAR: I move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* If there is no objection, unanimous consent will be assumed.

Mr. FARLEY and others: I object.

Mr. HOAR: I move that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SHERMAN: Let it be proceeded with informally, subject to the call for other business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The question is on the motion of the senator from Massachusetts. [Putting the question.] The Chair is uncertain from the sound and will ask for a division.

The motion was agreed to; there being on a division—ayes 32, noes 20.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The resolution is before the Senate and the senator from Georgia [Mr. Hill] has the floor.

Mr. HILL of Georgia: Mr. President, I do not intend to say one word on the subject of woman suffrage. I shall not get into that discussion which was alluded to by the senator from Massachusetts. The senator will remember, if he refreshes his recollection, that when my late colleague, now no longer a senator, made a motion for the appointment of a select committe in relation to the inter-oceanic canal, I opposed it distinctly, though it came from my colleague, upon the ground that the appointment of select committees ought to stop, that it was wrong; and I oppose this resolution for the same reason. I voted against a resolution to raise a select committee offered by a senator on this side of the chamber at the present session, and I have voted against all resolutions of that character.

No senator, in my judgment, will rise in his place in the Senate and say that it is necessary to appoint a special committee to consider the matters referred to in the resolution. It is true I am a member of the committee, and perhaps ought not to refer to it, but we have a standing committee, of which the distinguished senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Hoar] is chairman, the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that, I take occasion to say, is a very proper committee for this matter to go to; and that committee has almost nothing on earth to do. There is but one single subject-matter now before it, and I believe there will be scarcely another question before that committee at this session. There is not a contested election; there is not a dispute about anybody's seat; and yet it is a Committee on Privileges and Elections. What is the reason for going on continually and appointing these select committees, when there are standing committees here, properly organized to consider the very question specified by the resolution, with nothing to do?

Now, I am going to say one other thing. I do not pretend that the purpose I am now about to state is the purpose of the senator from Massachusetts. I have no reflections to make as to what this resolution is intended for, but we do know that there is an idea abroad that select committees are generally appointed for the purpose of giving somebody a chairmanship, that somebody may have a clerk. That is not the case here, I dare say. I do not mean to intimate that it is the case here, but it ought to be put a stop to; it is all wrong. I think, though, that there ought to be a resolution passed by this body giving every senator who has not a committee a clerk. Everybody knows that every chairman of a committee has a clerk in the clerk of that committee. The other senators, at least in my opinion, ought each to have a clerk. I would vote for such a resolution. I believe it would be right, and I believe the country would approve it. Every senator knows that he has more business to attend to here than he can possibly perform. Why, sir, if I were to attend to all the business in the departments and otherwise that my constituents ask me to perform, I could not discharge half my duties in this chamber; and every senator, I dare say, has the same experience. It is to the public

interest, therefore, in my judgment, that every senator should have a clerk. I am unable to employ a clerk from my own funds; many other senators are more fortunately situated; but still I must do that or move the appointment of a special committee for the purpose in an indirect way of getting a clerk. It is not right.

It has been said that if senators each have a clerk, for instance, a clerk at $100 a month salary during the session, which would be a very small matter, the members of the other House would each want a clerk. It does not follow. There is a vast difference. A member of the other House represents a narrow district, a single district; a senator represents a whole State. Take the State of New York. There are thirty-three representatives in the House from the State of New York; there are but two senators here from that State. Those two senators in all likelihood have as much business to perform here for their constituents as the thirty-three members of the House. There is, therefere, an eminent reason why a senator should have a clerk and why a member of the House should not.

I cannot vote for the appointment of select committees unless you raise a select committee for every senator in the body so as to give him a clerk. You have appointed select committees for this business and for that. It gives a few men an advantage when the business of the country does not require it, whereas if you appointed a clerk for each senator, with a nominal salary of $100 per month during the session, it would enable every senator to do his work more efficiently both here and for his constituents; it would put all the senators on a just equality; it would be in furtherance of the public interest; and it would avoid what I consider (with all due deference and not meaning to be offensive) the unseemly habit of constantly moving the appointment of select committees in this body. This is all I have to say. I vote against the resolution simply because I am opposed to the appointment of a select committee for this or any other purpose that I can now think of.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. VEST called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered, and the principal legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES of Florida (when his name was called): I propose to vote for this resolution, but at the same time I do not regard my vote as in any way committing myself on the subject of female suffrage. If they think an investigation of this subject should be had in this way, I for one am willing to have it. I vote "yea."

Mr. TELLER, (when his name was called): On this question I am paired with the senator from Alabama [Mr. Morgan]; otherwise I should vote "yea."

The roll-call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 35, nays 23; so the resolution was agreed to.*

---

* *Yeas*—Aldrich, Allison, Anthony, Blair, Cameron of Pa., Cameron of Wis., Conger, Davis of Ill., Dawes, Edmunds, Ferry, Frye, Harrison, Hawley, Hill of Col., Hoar, Jones of Fla., Jones of Nev., Kellogg, Lapham, Logan, McDill, McMillan, Miller of Cal., Mitchell, Morrill, Platt, Plumb, Ransom, Rollins, Saunders, Sawyer, Sewell, Sherman, Windom—35.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, December 20, 1881.

Mr. WHITE of Kentucky: I ask consent to offer for consideration at this time the resolution which I send to the clerk's desk.

The clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of seven members of the House of Representatives be appointed by the Speaker, to whom shall be referred all petitions, bills and resolves providing for the extension of suffrage to women, or for the removal of legal disabilities.

Mr. MILLS of Texas: I object.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: A similar resolution has already been referred to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER (Mr. Keifer of Ohio): Objection being made to its consideration at this time, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The resolution was referred accordingly.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, February 25, 1882.

Mr. REED of Maine: I rise to make a privileged report. The Committee on Rules, to whom were referred sundry resolutions relating to the subject, have instructed me to report the resolution which I send to the desk.

The clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a select committee of nine members be appointed, to whom shall be referred all petitions, bills and resolves asking for the extension of suffrage to women or the removal of their legal disabilities.

The SPEAKER: The question is on the adoption of the report of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HOLMAN of Indiana: I ask that the latter portion of the resolution be again read. It was not heard in this part of the house.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. TOWNSHEND of Illinois: I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TOWNSHEND: My inquiry is whether that resolution should not go to the House calendar.

The SPEAKER: It is a privileged report under the rules of the House from the Committee on Rules. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MCMILLIN of Tennessee: I make the point of order that it must lie over for one day.

The SPEAKER: It is the report of a committee privileged under the rules.

Mr. MCMILLIN: The committtee are privileged to report, but under the rule the report has to lie over a day.

Nays—Bayard, Beck, Brown, Butler, Camden, Cockrell, Coke, Davis of W. Va., Fair, Farley, Garland, Hampton, Hill of Ga., Jackson, Jonas, McPherson, Maxey, Saulsbury, Slater, Vance, Vest, Walker, Williams—23.

Absent—Call, George, Gorman, Groome, Grover, Hale, Harris, Ingalls, Johnston, Lamar, Mahone, Miller of N. Y., Morgan, Pendleton, Pugh, Teller, Van Wyck, Voorhees—18.

The members of the committee were Senators Lapham of New York, Anthony of Rhode Island, Blair of New Hampshire, Jackson of Tennessee, George of Mississippi, Ferry of Michigan and Fair of Nevada.

The SPEAKER: The gentleman from Tennessee will oblige the Chair by directing his attention to any rule which requires such a report to lie over one day. It changes no standing rule or order of the House.

Mr. MCMILLIN: It does, by making a change in the number and nature of the committees. All measures of a particular class, the resolution states, must be referred to the proposed committee, whereas heretofore they have been referred to a different committee. Therefore the resolution changes the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair is of opinion the resolution does not rescind or change any standing rule of the House. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this does distinctly change one of the standing rules of the House. One of the standing rules is—

The SPEAKER: The Chair has passed on that question, and no appeal has been taken from his decision.

Mr. SPRINGER: I desire to call the attention of the Chair to Rule 10, which specifically provides for the appointment of the full number of committees this House is to have, and this is not one of them.

The SPEAKER: Not one of the standing committees, but a select committee.

Mr. SPRINGER: That rule provides there shall be a certain number of committees, the names of which are therein given.

Mr. REED: I sincerely hope this will not be made a matter of technical discussion or debate. It is a matter upon which members of this House must have opinions which they can express by voting, in a very short time, without taking up the attention of the House beyond what is really necessary for a bare discussion of the merits of the question.

Mr. MCMILLIN: Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. REED: Certainly.

Mr. MCMILLIN: Would you not, as a parliamentarian, concede that this does change the existing rules of the House?

Mr. REED: By no manner of means, especially when the accomplished Speaker has decided the other way, and no gentleman has taken an appeal from his decision. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCMILLIN: Then you have no opinion beyond his decision?

The SPEAKER: The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Springer] that this resolution does not change any of the standing committees of the House which are provided for in Rule 10.

Mr. SPRINGER: It provides for a new committee.

The SPEAKER: It provides for a select committee. The subject was referred to the Committee on Rules by order of the House, and this is a report on the resolution so referred.

Mr. SPRINGER: The rule provides that no standing rule or order of the House shall be rescinded or changed without one day's notice.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would decide that this does not propose any change or rescinding of any standing rule of the House.

Digitized by Google

Mr. SPRINGER: Does the Chair hold that the making of a new rule is not a change of the existing rules?

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not decide anything of the kind.

Mr. SPRINGER: What does the Chair decide?

The SPEAKER: The Chair does not undertake to decide any such question, for it is not now presented.

Mr. SPRINGER: Is this not a new rule?

The SPEAKER: It is not.

Mr. SPRINGER: It is not?

The SPEAKER: It is a provision for a select committee.

Mr. SPRINGER: Can you have a committee without a rule of the House providing for it?

The SPEAKER: The question is on the adoption of the resolution reported from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. ATKINS: On that question I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 115, nays 84, not voting 93; so the resolution was carried.*

Mr. REED moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table. The latter motion was agreed to.

On Monday, March 13, 1882, the Chair announced the appointment of the following gentlemen as the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage authorized by the House: Mr. Camp of New York, Mr. White of Kentucky, Mr. Sherwin of Illinois, Mr. Stone of Massachusetts, Mr. Hepburn of Iowa, Mr. Springer of Illinois, Mr. Vance of North Carolina, Mr. Muldrow of Mississippi and Mr. Stockslager of Indiana.

The Annual Washington Convention was held in Lincoln Hall as usual, January 18, 19, 20, 1882. The afternoon before the convention, at an executive session held at the Riggs House,

---

* *Yeas*—Aldrich, Anderson, Bayne, Beach, Belford, Bingham, Black, Bliss, Brewer, Briggs, Browne, Brumm, Buck, Burrows, Julius C., Butterworth, Calkins, Camp, Campbell, Candler, Cannon, Carpenter, Caswell, Converse, Crapo, Davis, George R., Dawes, Deering, De Motte, Dezendorf, Dingley, Dwight, Farwell, Sewall S., Finley, Flower, Geddes, Grout, Hardenburgh, Harris, Henry, S., Haseltine, Haskell, Hawk, Hazelton, Heilman, Henderson, Hepburn, Hill, Hiscock, Horr, Houk, Hubbell, Humphrey, Hutchinson, Jacobs, Jadwin, Jones, Phineas, Kasson, Kelley, Ladd, Lord, Marsh, Mason, McClure, McCoid, McCook, McKinley, Miles, Miller, Moulton, Murch, Nolan, Norcross, O'Neill, Orth, Page, Parker, Paul, Payson, Poole, Pierce, Pettibone, Pound, Prescott, Ranney, Ray, Reed, Rice, Theron M., Richardson, D. P., Ritchie, Robeson, Robinson, Geo. D., Robinson, James S., Ryan, Scranton, Shallenberger, Sherwin, Skinner, Smith, A. Herr, Smith, Dietrich C., Spaulding, Spooner, Steele, Stephens, Stone, Strait, Taylor, Updegraff, J. T., Updegraff, Thomas, Valentine, Van Aernam, Walker, Watson, West, White, Williams, Chas. G., Willits—115.

Nays—Aiken, Atkins, Berry, Blackburn, Bland, Blount, Bragg, Buchanan, Buckner, Cabell, Caldwell, Cassiday, Chapman, Clark, Clements, Cobb, Colerick, Cox, William R., Covington, Cravens, Culberson, Curtin, Deuster, Dibrell, Dowd, Evins, Forney, Frost, Fulkerson, Garrison, Guenther, Gunter, Hammond, N. J., Hatch, Herbert, Hewitt, G. W. Hoge, Holman, House, Jones, George W., Jones, James K., Joyce, Kenna, Klotz, Knott, Latham, Leedom, Manning, Martin, Matson, McMillin, Mills, Money, Morrison, Mutchler, Oates, Phister, Reagan, Rosecrans, Ross, Schackleford, Shelley, Simonton, Singleton, Jas. W., Singleton, Otho R., Sparks, Speer, Springer, Stockslager, Thompson, P. B., Thompson, Wm. G., Tillman, Tucker, Turner, Henry G., Turner, Oscar, Upson, Vance, Warner, Whitthorne, Williams, Thomas, Willis, Wilson, Wise, George D., Young—84.

Digitized by Google

forty delegates were present from fourteen different States.* Among these were five from Massachusetts, and for the first time that State was represented on the platform of the National Association. Mrs. Stanton gave the opening address, and made some amusing criticisms on a recent debate on Senator Hoar's proposition for a special committee on the rights and disabilities of women. Such a committee had been under debate for several years and it was during this convention that the bill passed the Senate.

Invitations to attend the convention were sent to all the members of congress, and many were present during the various sessions. Miss Ellen H. Sheldon, secretary, read the minutes of the last convention, and, instead of the usual dry skeleton of facts, she gave a glowing description of that eventful occasion. Clara B. Colby gave an interesting narration of the progress of woman suffrage in Nebraska, and of the efforts being made to carry the proposition pending before the people, to strike the word "male" from the constitution in the coming November election.

Rev. Frederick A. Hinckley of Providence, R. I., spoke upon "Our Demand in the Light of Evolution." He said:

It is about a century since our forefathers declared that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and about a half century since woman began to see that she ought to be included in this declaration. At present the expressions of the Declaration of Independence are a "glittering generality," for only one-half of the people "consent." Modern science has demonstrated the truth of evolution—like causes produce like results—and this is seen in the progress of government and of woman. From the time when physical force ruled, up to the present, when *ostensibly* in the United States every person is his own ruler, there have been many steps. The importance of the masses has steadily taken the place of the importance of individuals. At first the idea was "You shall obey because I say so"; then, "You shall obey because I am your superior, and will protect you"; now it is "Everyone shall be his own protector." But we do not live up to this idea while only one-half instead of the whole of "everyone" is his own protector. The phases of woman's advancement are fitly described by the four words—slave, subject, inferior, dependent; and no step in this advance has been

* *Connecticut*, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Frances Ellen Burr. *Colorado*, Mrs. Elizabeth G. Campbell. *District of Columbia*, Ellen H. Sheldon, Jane H. Spofford, Dr. Caroline B. Winslow, Ellen M. O'Conner, Eliza Titus Ward, Belva A. Lockwood, Mrs. H. L. Shephard, Martha Johnson. *Indiana*, Helen M. Gongar, May Wright Sewall, Laura Kregelo, Alexiana S. Maxwell. *Maine*, Sophronia C. Snow. *Massachusetts*, Mrs. Harriet H. Robinson, Harriette R. Shattuck, Laura E. Brooks, Mary R. Brown, Emma F. Clary. *Nebraska*, Clara B. Colby. *New Jersey*, Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Chandler. *New York*, Mrs. Caroline Gilkey Rogers, Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Gage, Miss Anthony, Mrs. Helen M. Loder. *Pennsylvania*, Mrs. McClellan Brown, Rachel G. Foster, Emma C. Rhodes. *Rhode Island*, Rev. Frederick A Hinckley, Mrs. Burgess. *Wisconsin*, Miss Eliza Wilson and Mrs. Painter.

accomplished without a hard struggle. The logic of evolution in government points to universal suffrage. The same logic points to unqualified individual freedom for woman.

Mrs. Blake in reporting from her State said:

Governor Cornell was the first New York Governor to mention woman in an inaugural address, and the bill allowing women to vote in school elections was passed the same winter. There was a great deal of opposition in different parts of the State to the voting of women. In some country districts where the polls are in the school-houses, certain men went early and locked the doors, filled the room with smoke and even put tobacco on the stoves to make it as disagreeable for the women as possible. More respectable men had to ventilate and clean the rooms to make them decent for either man or woman. From this lowest class of opponents up to those who say: "My dear, you'd better not make yourself conspicuous!" the spirit is the same. Believing that under our constitution women are already entitled to the ballot, we do not ask for a constitutional amendment, but for a bill extending the suffrage at once.

Mrs. COLBY in contrast to this stated that in Nebraska the greatest courtesy had always been shown to women who voted at school elections There is only one organized effort against woman suffrage, and that is made by the "Sons of Liberty!" "O, Consistency, thou art a jewel!"

The following resolution introduced into the Senate, January 11, by Mr. Morgan of Alabama, was finally referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage. This was the first subject brought before them for action.

Resolved, That the committee on "The extension of suffrage to women, or the removal of their disabilities," be directed to examine into the state of the law regulating the right of suffrage in the territory of Utah, and report a bill to set aside and annul any law or laws enacted by the legislature of said territory conferring upon women the right of suffrage.

Miss Couzins made an admirable speech on the following resolution:

Resolved, That Senator Morgan's bill to deprive the *women* of Utah of the right of suffrage because of the social institutions and religious faith originated and maintained by the *men* of the territory, is a travesty on common justice. While the wife has not absolute possession of even one husband, and the husband has many wives, surely the men and not the women, if either, should be deprived of the suffrage.

Miss COUZINS said: The task of dealing fairly and justly with this territorial complication should never be committed to the blundering legislation of man alone. His success as a legislator and executive for woman in the past does not inspire a confidence that in this most serious problem he will be any the less an unbiased judge and law-giver. This government of men permitted the establishment of a religious colony, so called, whose basis of faith was the complete humiliation of women; recognized the system by appointing its chief, Brigham Young, governor of the territory, under whose fostering care polygamy grew to its present proportions.

That woman has not thrown off the yoke of religious despotism can be readily appreciated when we recognize the fact that man, from time immemorial, has played upon her religious faith to exalt his own attributes and degrade hers; that through this teaching her abiding belief in his superior capacity to interpret scriptural truths for her has been the means of sacrificing her power of mind, her tender affections, her delicate sensibilities, on the altar of his base selfishness throughout the ages. Orthodoxy recognizes no "inspiration" for woman to-day. She is not "called" save to serve man. Under its teaching her thought has been padlocked in the name of Divinity, and her lips sealed in sacrilegious pretense of authority from heaven; and nothing so clearly bespeaks the degenerating influence of the ages of this masculine teaching as the absolute faith manifested by the women of Utah in this *ipse dixit* of man's religious doctrine. Their emancipation must necessarily be slow.

The paternal government allowed polygamy to be planted, take root, and grow in a wilderness where the attraction of nobler minds and freer thoughts was not known. The victims came from the political despotisms of the old world to be shackled in a land of freedom with a still darker despotism, and under the ægis of the American flag they have borne children as a religious duty they owed to God and man; and surely it can not be expected, even with that grand emancipator from king and priestcraft rule, the ballot, that at once they will vote themselves outcast and their children illegitimate.

It took the white men of this nation one hundred years to put away that relic of barbarism, slavery; the removal of the twin relic will come through liberty for woman, higher education for children, and the incoming tide of Gentile immigration. The fitting act of justice is not disfranchisement of woman, as Senator Morgan proposes, and the reënactment of that old Adamic cry: "The woman whom thou gavest," but the disfranchisement of man, who is the only polygamist, and the stepping down and out of the sex as a legislator under whose fostering care this evil has grown. Retire to your sylvan groves and academic shades, gentlemen, as Mrs. Stanton suggests, and let the Deborahs, the Huldahs, and the Vashtis come to the front, and let us see what we can do toward the remedy of your wretched legislation. But suffrage for women in Utah has accomplished great good. I spent one week there in close observation. Outside of their religious convictions, the women are emphatic in condemnation of wrong. Their votes banished the liquor saloon. I saw no drunkenness anywhere; the poison of tobacco smoke is not allowed to vitiate the air of heaven, either on the streets or in public assemblies. Their court-room was a model of neatness and good order. Plants were in the windows and handsome carpets graced the floor. During my stay, the daughter of a Mormon, the then advocate-general of the territory, was admitted to the bar by Chief-Justice McKean of the United States Court, who, in fitting and beautiful language, welcomed her to the profession as a woman whose knowledge of the law fitted her to be the peer of any man in his court. She told me that she detested polygamy, but felt that she could render greater service to the emancipation of her sex inside of

Digitized by Google

Utah than out. At midnight I wandered, with one of my own sex, about the streets to test the assertion that it was as safe for women then as at mid-day. No bacchanalian shout rent the air; no man was seen reeling in maudlin imbecility to his home. No guardians put in an appearance, save the stars above our heads; no sound awoke the stillness but the purling of the mountain brooks which washed the streets in cleanliness and beauty. What other city on this continent can present such a showing? With murder for man and rapine for woman where man alone is maker and guardian of the laws, it behooves him to pause ere he launches invectives at the one result of woman's votes.

Mrs. Gougar, on our Washington platform for the first time, delighted the audience with her readiness and wit. She has a good voice, fine presence, and speaks fluently, without notes.

She spoke of the reformatory prison for women in her State, and said that the statistics showed that eighty-two per cent. of the women confined there were sent out reformed. Speaking of the gallantry of men, she cited a case of a man who came to an Indiana lawyer and desired him to make a will. The following conversation ensued: "I want you to make this will so that my wife will have $400 a year; that's enough for any woman." "Is she the only wife you ever had?" "Yes." "How long have you been married?" "Forty-two years." "How many children have you had?" "Eleven." "Did you have all your property before marriage?" "No; didn't have a cent; I've earned it all." "Has your wife helped you in any way to earn it?" "Why, yes, I suppose she has; but then I want to fix my will so she can only have $400 a year; it's enough." "Well, sir, you will have to move out of the State of Indiana then, for the law provides for the wife better than that, and you will have to get another lawyer." It is needless to say that this lawyer is a staunch champion of woman suffrage, and it is pleasant to know that there are more such men being educated by this agitation.

Mrs. Maxwell gave a fine recitation of "The Dying Soldier," at one of the evening sessions. It was evident by the sparkling eyes of the Indiana delegation that the ladies had in reserve some pleasant surprise for the convention, which at last revealed itself in the person of Judge Orth, a live member of congress from Indiana, who stood up like a man and avowed his belief in woman suffrage. His words were few but to the point, and his hearers all knew exactly where he stood on the question.

The next evening the Nebraska delegation, determining not to be outdone, captured one of their United States senators and triumphantly brought him on the platform. It was a point gained to have a congressman publicly give in his adhesion to the question, but how much greater the achievement to appear in the convention with a United States senator. It was a proud

moment for Mrs. Colby when Senator Saunders, a large man of fine proportions, stepped to the front. But alas! her triumph over the Indiana ladies was short indeed, for while the senator surpassed the representative in size and official honors, he fell far below him in the logic of his statements and the earnestness of his principles. In fact the audience and the platform were in doubt at the close of his remarks as to his true position on the question. Mrs. May Wright Sewall, who followed him, sparkled with the satisfaction she expressed in paying most glowing tributes to the men of Indiana and their State institutions. She said:

The principal objection to woman suffrage has always been that it will take women from their homes and destroy all home life. She showed that there is not an interest of home which is not represented in the State, and that the subordination of the State to the family has kept pace with the subordination of physical to spiritual force. Woman has an interest in everything which affects the State, and only lacks the legitimate instrument of these interests—the ballot—with which to enforce them. Life regulates legislation. Domestic life is woman's sphere, but a sphere of much larger dimensions than has ever yet been accorded it, these dimensions reaching out and controlling the functions of the State. The ballot is not a political or a military, but a domestic necessity.

Mrs. Harriette R. Shattuck spoke on the golden rule, asking men to put themselves in the place of disfranchised women, and then legislate for them as they would be legislated for. Mrs. Robinson gave a résumé of the legal, political and educational position of women in Massachusetts. Mrs. Hooker showed that political equality would dignify woman in home life, give added weight to her opinions on all questions, and command new respect for her from all classes of men. Mrs. Colby gave an interesting address on "The Social Evolution of Woman":

She traced the history of woman from the time when she was bought and sold, up to the present. She said that the first believer in woman's rights was the one who first proposed that women should be allowed to eat with their husbands. This once granted, everything else has followed of necessity, and the ballot will be the crowning right. Once women were not allowed to sing soprano because it was the "governing part." From these and many like indignities woman has gradually evolved until she now stands on an equality with man in many social rights.

Martha McClellan Brown read an able essay on "The Power of the Veto." She is a woman of fine presence, pleasing manners and a well trained voice that can fill any hall. Her address was one of the best in the convention and all felt that in her we had

Digitized by Google

a valuable acquisition to our Association. Mrs. Gage gave an able address on "The Moral Force of Woman Suffrage."

During the first day of the convention a request, signed by the officers of the association, was sent to the Special Committee on Woman Suffrage in the Senate, asking for a hearing on the sixteenth amendment to the constitution. The hearing was granted on Friday morning, January 20, 1882. A distinguished speaker in England having advised the friends of suffrage there to employ young and attractive women to advocate the measure, as the speediest means of success, Miss Anthony took the hint in making the selection for the first hearing before the committee of those who had never been heard before,* of whom some were young, and all attractive as speakers. Miss Anthony said that she would introduce some new speakers to the committee, in order to disprove the allegation that "it was always the same old set." The committee listened to them with undivided attention throughout, and at the conclusion of the hearing the following resolution, offered by Senator George of Mississippi, was adopted unanimously:

Resolved, That the committee are under obligations to the representatives of the women of the United States for their attendance this morning, and for the able and instructive addresses which have been made, and that the committee assure them that they will give to the subject of woman suffrage the careful and impartial consideration which its grave importance demands.

In describing the occasion for the *Boston Transcript*, Mrs. Shattuck said:

As we stood in the committee-room and presented our plea for freedom, we felt that at last we had obtained a fair hearing, whatever its result might be. And the most encouraging sign of the impression made by our words was the change in the faces of some of the members of the committee as the speaking went on. At first there was a look of indifference and scorn—merely toleration; this gradually changed to interest mingled with surprise; finally, as Miss Anthony closed with one of her most eloquent appeals, all the faces showed a decided and almost eager interest in what we had to say. Senator George, who certainly looked more unpropitious than any other one, assured the ladies that he would give to the subject of woman suffrage that careful and impartial consideration which its grave importance demands. This, from one who heralded his entrance by inquiring of Miss Anthony, in stentorian tones, if she "wanted to go to war," was, to say the least, a concession. The speakers were closely questioned by some members of the committee, who afterwards told us "that they had never heard a speech on the subject before

* Short speeches were made by Mrs. Robinson and Mrs. Shattuck of Massachusetts, Mrs. Sewall and Mrs. Gougar of Indiana, Mrs. Saxon of Louisiana, Mrs. Colby of Nebraska.

and were surprised to find so much in the demand, and to see such ability as was manifested by the women before them."

The committee having expressed a wish to hear others on the subject, appointed the next morning at 10 o'clock.* Mrs. Stanton, being introduced by the chairman, said:

Gentlemen, when the news of the appointment of this committee was flashed over the wires, you cannot imagine the satisfaction that thrilled the hearts of your countrywomen. After fourteen years of constant petitioning, we are grateful for even this slight recognition at last. I never before felt such an interest in any congressional committee, and I have no doubt that all who are interested in this reform, share in my feelings. Fortunately your names make a great couplet in rhyme,

Lapham, Anthony and Blair,
Jackson, George, Ferry and Fair.

which will enable us to remember them always. This I discovered in writing your names in this volume, which allow me to present you.

The gentlemen rising in turn received with a gracious bow "The History of Woman Suffrage" which, Mrs. Stanton told them, would furnish all the arguments they needed to defend their clients against the ignorance and prejudice of the world. Mr. George of Mississippi asked why this agitation was confined to Northern women; he had never heard the ladies of the South express the wish to vote. Mrs. Stanton referred him to those to whom the volume before him was dedicated. "There," said she, "you will find the names of two ladies from one of the most distinguished families in South Carolina, who came North over forty years ago, and set this ball for woman's freedom in motion. But for those noble women, Sarah and Angelina Grimkè, we might not stand here to-day pleading for justice and equality." As the speakers had requested the committee to ask questions, they were frequently interrupted. All urged the importance of a national protection, preferring congressional action, to submitting the proposition to the popular vote of the several States. On this point Mr. Jackson of Tennessee asked many pertinent questions. Mrs. Shattuck, writing of this occasion to the *Boston Transcript*, said:

One of the speakers eloquently testified to the interest of many Southern women in this subject, and urged the Southern members of the committee not to declare that the women of the South do not want the ballot until they have investigated the matter. After the hearing three Southern

* When Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Gage and Mrs. Blake of New York, Mrs. Hooker of Connecticut and Mrs. Saxon of Louisiana, and Mrs. Sewall, by special request of the chairman, again addressed the committee.

Digitized by Google

ladies, wives of congressmen, thanked her for what she had said. The member from Mississippi showed a great deal of interest and really became quite waked up before the session ended. But, when we look at it in one light, there is something exceedingly humiliating in the thought that women representing the best intellect and the highest morality of our country, should come here in their grand old age and ask men for that which is theirs by right. Is it not time that this aristocracy of sex should be overthrown? Several of the senators were so moved by the speeches that they personally expressed their thanks, and one who has long been friendly, said the speeches were far above the average committee-hearings on any subject. We might well have replied that the reason is because all the speakers feel what they say and know that the question is one of vital importance.

In securing these hearings before this special committee of the Senate the friends feel they have reached a milestone in the progress of their reform. To secure the attention for four hours of seven representative men of the United States, must have more effect than would a hundred times that amount of time and labor expended upon their constituents. If one of these senators, for instance, should become convinced of the justice of woman's claim to the ballot, his constituency would begin to look upon that question with respect, whereas it would take years to bring that same constituency up to the position where they could elect such a representative. To convince the representatives is to sound the keynote, and it is for this reason that these hearings before the Senate committee are of such paramount importance to the suffrage cause.

At the close of the hearing Mrs. Robinson presented each member of the committee with her little volume, "Massachusetts in the Woman Suffrage Movement."

January 23 the House Committee on Rules* gave a hearing to Mrs. Jane Graham Jones of Chicago, Mrs. May Wright Sewall and Miss Anthony. During this congress the question of admitting the territory of Dakota as a State was discussed in the Senate. Our committee stood ready to oppose it unless the word "male" were stricken from the proposed constitution.

Immediately after this most of the speakers went † to Philadelphia where Rachel Foster had made arrangements for a two-days convention. Rev. Charles G. Ames gave the address of welcome.

He told of his conversion to woman suffrage from the time when he believed women and men were ordained to be unequal, just as in nature the mountain is different from the valley—he looking down at her, she gazing up at him—until the time when he began to see that women are not of necessity the valleys, nor men of necessity the mountains; and so on, until

* Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Robeson, and Mr. Reed were present.

† Mrs. Saxon, Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Sewall, Mrs. McClellan Brown, Mrs. Colby, Miss Couzins, Miss Anthony, Edward M. Davis, Robert Purvis, Mrs. Shattuck, Rev. Frederick A. Hinckley, Mrs. Robinson.

now he believes women entitled to stand on an equal plane with men, socially and politically.

The President, Mrs. Stanton, responded. Hannah Whitehall Smith of Germantown, prominent in the temperance movement, spoke of the hardship of farmers' wives, and asked:

If that condition was not one of slavery which obliged a woman to rise early and cook the family breakfast while her husband lay in bed; to work all day long, and then in the evening, while he smoked his pipe or enjoyed himself at the corner grocery, to mend and patch his old clothes. But she thought the position of woman was changing for the better. Even among the Indians a better feeling is beginning to prevail. It is Indian etiquette for the man to kill the deer or bear, and leave it on the spot where it is struck down for the woman to carry home. She must drag it over the ground or carry it on her back as best she may, while he quietly awaits her coming in the family wigwam. A certain Indian, after observing that white folks did differently by their women, once resolved to follow their example. But such was the force of public opinion that, when it was discovered that he brought home his own game, both he and his wife were murdered. This shows what fearful results prejudice may bring about; and the only difference between the prejudice which ruled his tribe in regard to woman and that which rules white American men to-day, is a difference in degree, dependent upon the difference in enlightenment. The principle is the same. The result would be the same were each equally ignorant.

The familiar faces of Edward M. Davis, Mary Grew, Adeline Thompson, Sarah Pugh, Anna McDowell and two of Lucretia Mott's noble daughters, gladdened many a heart during the various sessions of the convention. Beautiful tributes were paid to Mrs. Mott by several of the speakers. The Philadelphia convention was supplemented by a most delightful social gathering, without mention of which a report of the occasion would be incomplete:

Like many historical events, this was entirely unpremeditated, no one who participated in its pleasures had any forewarning, aside from an informal invitation to lunch with Mrs. Hannah Whitehall Smith and her generous husband, both earnest friends of temperance and important allies of the woman suffrage movement. Mrs. Smith met the guests at the station in Philadelphia, tickets in hand, marshaling them to their respective seats in the cars as if born to command, and on arriving at Germantown, transferred them to carriages in waiting, with the promptness of a railroad official. Without noise or confusion one and all crossed the threshold of her well-ordered mansion, and with other invited guests were soon seated in the spacious parlor, talking in groups here and there. "Ah!" said Mrs. Smith on entering, "this will never do, think of all the good things that will be lost in these side talks. My plan is to have a general conversation, a kind of love-feast, each telling her experience. It would be pleasant to

know how each has reached the same platform, through the tangled labyrinths of human life." Soon all was silence and one after another related the special incidents in childhood, girlhood and mature years that had turned her thoughts to the consideration of woman's position. The stories were as varied as they were pathetic and amusing, and were listened to amidst smiles and tears with the deepest interest. And when all * had finished the tender revelations of the hopes and fears, the struggles and triumphs through which each soul had passed, these sacred memories seemed to bind us anew together in a friendship that we hope may never end. A sumptuous lunch followed, and amid much gaiety and laughter the guests dispersed, giving the hospitable host and hostess a warm farewell—a day to be remembered by all of us.

Our Senate committee, through its chairman, Hon. Elbridge G. Lapham, very soon reported in favor of the submission of a sixteenth amendment. We had had a favorable minority report in the House in 1871 and in the Senate in 1879—but this was the first favorable majority report we had ever had in either house:

IN THE SENATE, MONDAY, June 5, 1882.

Mr. LAPHAM: I am instructed by the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. No. 60) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to report it with a favorable recommendation, without amendment, for the consideration of the Senate. This is a majority report, and the minority desire the opportunity to present their report also, and have printed the reasons which they give for dissenting. As this is a question of more than ordinary importance, I should like to have 1,000 extra copies of the report printed for the use of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE: I present the views of the minority of the committee, consisting of the senator from Tennessee [Mr. Jackson], the senator from Nevada [Mr. Fair], and myself.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore:* It is moved that 1,000 extra copies of the report be printed for the use of the Senate.

Mr. ANTHONY: The motion should go by the statute to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. LAPHAM: I will present it in the form of a resolution for reference to the Committee on Printing.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That 1,000 additional copies of the report and views of the minority on Senate Joint Resolution No. 60 be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

In the Senate of the United States, June 5, 1882, Mr. Lapham, from the Committee on Woman Suffrage, submitted the following report:

* Those present were Mesdames Spofford, Stanton, Robinson, Shattuck, Sewall and Saxon; Misses Thompson, Anthony, Couzins and Foster. Many pleasant ladies from the Society of Friends were there also and contributed to the dignity and interest of the occasion.

Digitized by Google

The Select Committee on Woman Suffrage, to whom was referred Senate Resolution No. 60, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to secure the right of suffrage to all citizens without regard to sex, having considered the same, respectfully report:

The gravity and importance of the proposed amendment must be obvious to all who have given the subject the consideration it demands.

A very brief history of the origin of this movement in the United States and of the progress made in the cause of female suffrage will not be out of place at this time. A World's Anti-slavery Convention was held in London on June 12, 1840, to which delegates from all the organized societies were invited. Several of the American societies sent women as delegates. Their credentials were presented, and an able and exhaustive discussion was had by many of the leading men of America and Great Britain upon the question of their being admitted to seats in the convention. They were allowed no part in the discussion. They were denied seats as delegates, and, by reason of that denial, it was determined to hold conventions after their return to the United States, for the purpose of asserting and advocating their rights as citizens, and especially the right of suffrage. Prior to this, and as early as the year 1836, a proposal had been made in the legislature of the State of New York to confer upon married women their separate rights of property. The subject was under consideration and agitation during the eventful period which preceded the constitutional convention of New York in the year 1846, and the radical changes made in the fundamental law in that year. In 1848 the first act "For the More Effectual Protection of the Property of Married Women" was passed by the legislature of New York and became a law. It passed by a vote of 93 to 9 in the Assembly and 23 to 1 in the Senate. It was subsequently amended so as to authorize women to engage in business on their own account and to receive their own earnings. This legislation was the outgrowth of a bill prepared several years before under the direction of the Hon. John Savage, chief-justice of the Supreme Court, and of the Hon. John C. Spencer, one of the ablest lawyers in the State, one of the revisers of the statutes of New York, and afterward a cabinet officer. Laws granting separate rights of property and the right to transact business, similar to those adopted in New York, have been enacted in many, if not in most of the States, and may now be regarded as the settled policy of American legislation on the subject.

After the enactment of the first law in New York, as before stated, and in the month of July, 1848, the first convention demanding suffrage for women was held at Seneca Falls in said State. The same persons who had been excluded from the World's Convention in London were prominent and instrumental in calling the meeting and in framing the declaration of sentiments adopted by it, which, after reciting the unjust limitations and wrongs to which women are subjected, closed in these words:

Now, in view of this entire disfranchisement of one-half of the people of this country and their social and religious degradation; in view of the unjust laws above mentioned, and because women do feel themselves aggrieved, oppressed and fraudulently deprived of their most sacred rights, we insist that they have immediate admission to

Digitized by Google

all the rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of the United States. In entering upon the great work before us we anticipate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation and ridicule; but we shall use every instrumentality within our power to effect our object. We shall employ agents, circulate tracts, petition the State and national legislatures, and endeavor to enlist the pulpit and the press in our behalf. We hope this convention will be followed by a series of conventions embracing every part of the country.

The meeting also adopted a series of resolutions, one of which was in the following words:

Resolved, That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise.

This declaration was signed by seventy of the women of Western New York, among whom was one or more of those who addressed your committee on the subject of the pending amendment, and there were present, participating in and approving of the movement, a large number of prominent men, among whom were Elisha Foote, a lawyer of distinction, and since that time Commissioner of Patents, and the Hon. Jacob Chamberlain, who afterwards represented his district in the other House. From the movement thus inaugurated, conventions have been held from that time to the present in the principal villages, cities and capitals of the various States, as well as the capital of the nation.

The First National Convention upon the subject was held at Worcester, Mass., in October, 1850, and had the support and encouragement of many leading men of the republic, among whom we name the following: Gerrit Smith, Joshua R. Giddings, Ralph Waldo Emerson, John G. Whittier, A. Bronson Alcott, Samuel J. May, Theodore Parker, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Elizur Wright, William J. Elder, Stephen S. Foster, Horace Greeley, Oliver Johnson, Henry Ward Beecher, Horace Mann. The Fourth National Convention was held at the city of Cleveland, Ohio, October, 1853. The Rev. Asa Mahan, president of Oberlin College, and Hon. Joshua R. Giddings were there. Horace Greeley and William Henry Channing addressed letters to the convention. The letter of Mr. Channing stated the proposition to be that—

The right of suffrage be granted to the people, universally, without distinction of sex; and that the age for attaining legal and political majority be made the same for women as for men.

In 1857, Hon. Salmon P. Chase, chief-justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, then governor of Ohio, recommended to the legislature a constitutional amendment on the subject, and a select committee of the Senate made an elaborate report, concluding with a resolution in the following words:

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee be instructed to report to the Senate a bill to submit to the qualified electors, at the next general election for senators and representatives, an amendment to the constitution, whereby the elective franchise shall be extended to the citizens of Ohio *without distinction of sex*.

During the same year a similar report was made in the legislature of Wisconsin. From the report on the subject we quote the following:

We believe that political equality, by leading the thoughts and purposes of men and women into the same channel, will more completely carry out the designs of

nature. Woman will be possessed of a positive power, and hollow compliments will be exchanged for well-grounded respect when we see her nobly discharging her part in the great intellectual and moral struggles of the age that wait their solution by a direct appeal to the ballot-box. Woman's power is at present poetical and unsubstantial; let it be practical and real. There is no reality in any power that cannot be coined in votes.

The effect of these discussions and efforts has been the gradual advancement of public sentiment towards conceding the right of suffrage without distinction of sex. In the territories of Wyoming and Utah, full suffrage has already been given. In regard to the exercise of the right in the territory of Wyoming, the present governor of that territory, Hon. John W. Hoyt, in an address delivered in Philadelphia, April 3, 1882, in answer to a question as to the operation of the law, said:

First of all, the experience of Wyoming has shown that the only actual trial of woman suffrage hitherto made—a trial made in a new country where the conditions were not exceptionably favorable—has produced none but the most desirable results. And surely none will deny that in such a matter a single ounce of experience is worth a ton of conjecture. But since it may be claimed that the sole experiment of Wyoming does not afford a sufficient guaranty of general expediency, let us see whether reason will not furnish a like answer. The great majority of women in this country already possess sufficient intelligence to enable them to vote judiciously on nearly all questions of a local nature. I think this will be conceded. Secondly, with their superior quickness of perception, it is fair to assume that when stimulated by a demand for a knowledge of political principles—such a demand as a sense of the responsibility of the voter would create—they would not be slow in rising to at least the rather low level at present occupied by the average masculine voter. So that, viewing the subject from an intellectual stand-point merely, such fears as at first spring up, drop away, one by one, and disappear. But it must not be forgotten that a very large proportion of questions to be settled by the ballot, both those of principle and such as refer to candidates, have in them a *moral* element which is vital. And here we are safer with the ballot in the hands of woman; for her keener insight and truer moral sense will more certainly guide her aright—and not her alone, but also, by reflex action, all whose minds are open to the influence of her example. The weight of this answer can hardly be overestimated. In my judgment, this moral consideration far more than offsets all the objections that can be based on any assumed lack of an intellectual appreciation of the few questions almost wholly commercial and economical. Last of all, a majority of questions to be voted on touch the interests of woman as they do those of man. It is upon her finer sensibilities, her purer instincts, and her maternal nature that the results of immorality and vice in every form fall with more crushing weight.

A criticism has been made upon the exercise of this right by the women of Utah that the plural wives in that territory are under the control of their polygamous husbands. Be that as it may, it is an undoubted fact that there is probably no city of equal size on this continent where there is less disturbance of the peace, or where the citizen is more secure in his person or property, either by day or night, than in the city of Salt Lake. A qualified right of suffrage has also been given to women in Oregon, Colorado, Minnesota, Nebraska, Kansas, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Michigan, Kentucky, and New York. Of the operation of the law in the last-named State, Governor Cornell in a message to the legislature on May 12, said:

Digitized by Google

The recent law, 1882, making women eligible as school trustees, has produced admirable results, not only in securing the election of many of them as trustees of schools, but especially in elevating the qualifications of men proposed as candidates for school-boards, and also in stimulating greater interest in the management of schools generally. The effect of these new experiences is to widen the influence and usefulness of women.

So well satisfied are the representatives in the legislature of that State with these results that the assembly, by a large majority, recently passed to a third reading an act giving the full right of suffrage to women, the passage of which has been arrested in the Senate by an opinion of the attorney-general that a constitutional amendment is necessary to accomplish the object. In England women are allowed to vote at all municipal elections, and hold the office of guardian of the poor. In four States, Nebraska, Indiana, Oregon, and Iowa, propositions have passed their legislatures and are now pending, conferring the right of suffrage upon women.

Notwithstanding all these efforts, it is the opinion of the best informed men and women, who have devoted more than a third of a century to the consideration and discussion of the subject, that an amendment to the federal constitution, analogous to the fifteenth amendment of that instrument, is the most safe, direct, and expeditious mode of settling the question. It is the question of the enfranchisement of half the race now denied the right, and that, too, the most favored half in the estimation of those who deny the right. Petitions, from time to time, signed by many thousands, have been presented to congress, and there are now upon our files seventy-five petitions representing eighteen different States. Two years ago treble the number of petitions, representing over twenty-five States, were presented.

If congress should adopt the pending resolution, the question would go before the intelligent bodies who are chosen to represent the people in the legislatures of the various States, and would receive a more enlightened and careful consideration than if submitted to the masses of the male population, with all their prejudices, in the form of an amendment to the constitutions of the several States. Besides, such an amendment, if adopted, would secure that uniformity in the exercise of the right which could not be expected by action from the several States. We think the time has arrived for the submission of such an amendment to the legislatures of the States. We know the prejudices which the movement for suffrage to all without regard to sex, had to encounter from the very outset, prejudices which still exist in the minds of many. The period for employing the weapons of ridicule and enmity has not yet passed. Now, as in the beginning, we hear appeals to prejudice and the baser passions of men. The anathema, "woe betide the hand that plucks the wizard beard of hoary error," is yet employed to deter men from acting upon their convictions as to what ought to be done with reference to this great question. To those who are inclined to cast ridicule upon the movement, we quote the answer made while one of the early conventions was in session in the State of New York:

A collection of women arguing for political rights and for the privileges usually conceded only to the other sex is one of the easiest things in the world to make fun

of. There is no end to the smart speeches and the witty remarks that may be made on the subject. But when we seriously attempt to show that a woman who pays taxes ought not to have a voice in the manner in which the taxes are expended, that a woman whose property and liberty and person are controlled by the laws should have no voice in framing those laws, it is not so easy. If women are fit to rule in a monarchy, it is difficult to say why they are not qualified to vote in a republic; nor can there be greater indelicacy in a woman going to the ballot-box than there is in a woman opening a legislature or issuing orders to an army.

To all who are more serious in their opposition to the movement, we would remind them of the words of a few distinguished men :—

I go for all sharing the privileges of the government who assist in bearing its burdens, by no means excluding women.—[ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

I believe that the vices in our large cities will never be conquered until the ballot is put into the hands of women.—[Bishop SIMPSON.

I do not think our politics will be what it ought to be till women are legislators and voters.—[Rev. JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

Women have quite as much interest in good government as men, and I have never heard or read of any satisfactory reason for excluding them from the ballot-box; I have no more doubt of their ameliorating influence upon politics than I have of the influence they exert everywhere else.—[GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS.

In view of the terrible corruption of our politics, people ask, can we maintain universal suffrage? I say no, not without women. The only bear-gardens in our community are the town-meeting and the caucus. Why is this? Because these are the only places at which women are not present.—[Bishop GILBERT HAVEN.

I repeat my conviction of the right of woman suffrage. Because suffrage is a right and not a grace, it should be extended to women who bear their share of the public cost, and who have the same interest that I have in the selection of officials and the making of laws which affect their lives, their property, and their happiness.—[Governor LONG of Massachusetts.

However much the giving of political power to woman may disagree with our notions of propriety, we conclude that, being required by that first prerequisite to greater happiness, the law of equal freedom, such a concession is unquestionably right and good.—[HERBERT SPENCER.

In the administration of a State neither a woman as a woman, nor a man as a man has any special functions, but the gifts are equally diffused in both sexes. The same opportunity for self-development which makes man a good guardian will make woman a good guardian, for their original nature is the same.—[PLATO.

It has become a custom, almost universal, to invite and to welcome the presence of women at political assemblages, to listen to discussions upon the topics involved in the canvass. Their presence has done much toward the elevation, refinement, and freedom from insincerity and hypocrisy, of such discussions. Why would not the same results be wrought out by their presence at the ballot-box? Wherever the right has been exercised by law, both in England and this country, such has been its effect in the conduct of elections.

The framers of our system of government embodied in the Declaration of Independence the statement that to secure the rights which are therein declared to be inalienable and in respect to which all men are created equal, "governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." The system of representative government they inaugurated can only be maintained and perpetuated by allow-

Digitized by Google

ing all citizens to give that consent through the medium of the ballot-box —the only mode in which the "consent of the governed" can be obtained. To deny to one-half of the citizens of the republic all participation in framing the laws by which they are to be governed, simply on account of their sex, is political despotism to those who are excluded, and "taxation without representation" to such of them as have property liable to taxation. Their investiture with separate estates leads, logically and necessarily, to their right to the ballot as the only means afforded them for the protection of their property, as it is the only means of their full protection in the enjoyment of the immeasurably greater right to life and liberty. To be governed without such consent is clear denial of a right declared to be inalienable.

It is said that the majority of women do not desire and would not exercise the right, if acknowledged. The assertion rests in conjecture. In ordinary elections multitudes of men do not exercise the right. It is only in extraordinary cases, and when their interests and patriotism are appealed to, that male voters are with unanimity found at the polls. It would doubtless be the same with women. In the exceptional instances in which the exercise of the right has been permitted, they have engaged with zeal in every important canvass. Even if the statement were founded in fact, it furnishes no argument in favor of excluding women from the exercise of the franchise. *It is the denial of the right of which they complain.* There are multitudes of men whose vote can be purchased at an election for the smallest and most trifling consideration. Yet all such would spurn with scorn and unutterable contempt a proposition to purchase their *right to vote*, and no consideration would be deemed an equivalent for such a surrender. Women are more sensitive upon this question than men, and so long as this right, deemed by them to be sacred, is denied, so long the agitation which has marked the progress of this contest thus far will be continued.

Entertaining these views, your committee report back the proposed resolution without amendment for the consideration of the Senate, and recommend its passage.

E. G. LAPHAM,
T. M. FERRY,
H. W. BLAIR.

The constitution is wisely conservative in the provision for its own amendment. It is eminently proper that whenever a large nunber of the people have indicated a desire for an amendment, the judgment of the amending power should be consulted. In view of the extensive agitation of the question of woman suffrage, and the numerous and respectable petitions that have been presented to congress in its support, I unite with the committee in recommending that the proposed amendment be submitted to the States.

H. B. ANTHONY.

June 5, 1882, Mr. George, from the Committee on Woman Suffrage, submitted the following views of the minority:

The undersigned are unable to concur in the report of the majority recommending the adoption of the joint resolution proposing an amend-

Digitized by Google

ment to the Constitution of the United States, for reasons which they will now proceed to state.

We do not base our dissent upon any ground having relation to the expediency or inexpediency of vesting in women the right to vote. Hence we shall not discuss the very grave and important social and political questions which have arisen from the agitation to admit to equal political rights the women of our country, and to impose on them the burden of discharging, equally with men, political and public duties. Whether so radical a change in our political and social system would advance the happiness and welfare of the American people, considered as a whole, without distinction of sex, is a question on which there is a marked disagreement among the most enlightened and thoughtful of both sexes. Its solution involves considerations so intimately pertaining to all the relations of social and private life—the family circle—the status of women as wives, mothers, daughters, and companions, to the functions in private and public life which they ought to perform, and their ability and willingness to perform them—the harmony and stability of marriage, and the division of the labors and cares of that union—that we are convinced that the proper and safe discussion and weighing of them would be best secured by deliberations in the separate communities which have so deep an interest in the rightful solution of this grave question. Great organic changes in government, especially when they involve, as this proposed change does, a revolution in the modes of life, long-standing habits, and the most sacred domestic relations of the people, should result only upon the demand of the people, who are to be affected by them. Such changes should originate with, and be molded and guided in their operation and extent by, the people themselves. They should neither precede their demand for them, nor be delayed in opposition to their clearly expressed wishes. Their happiness, their welfare, their advancement, are the sole objects of the institution of government; of these they are not only the best, but they are the exclusive judges. They have commissioned us to exercise for their good the great powers which they have intrusted to us by their letter of attorney, the constitution; not to assume to ourselves a superior wisdom, or usurp a guardianship over them, dictating reforms not demanded by them, and attempting to grasp power not granted.

The organization of our political institutions is such that the great mass of the powers of government, the proper exercise of which so deeply concerns the welfare of the people, is left to the States. In that depository the will of the people is most certainly ascertained, and the exercise of power is more directly under their guidance. Our free institutions have had their great development and owe their stability more to causes connected with the direct exercise of the power of the people in local self-government than to all other causes combined. Recent events, though tending strongly to centralization, have not destroyed in the public mind the inestimable value of local self-government. Among the powers which have hitherto been esteemed as most essential to the public welfare is the power of the States to regulate their domestic institutions in their own way; and among those institutions none has been preserved by the

Digitized by Google

States with greater jealousy than their absolute control over marriage and the relation between the sexes.

Another power of the States, deemed by the people when they assented to the Constitution of the United States most essential to the public welfare, was the right of each State to determine the qualifications of electors. Wherever the federal constitution speaks of elections for a federal office, it adopts the qualifications for electors prescribed by the State in which the election is to be held.

Nor has this fundamental rule been departed from in the fifteenth amendment. That impairs it only to the extent that race, color, or previous condition of servitude shall not be made a ground of exclusion from the right of suffrage. In all else that pertains to the qualifications of electors the absolute will of the State prevails. This amendment was inserted from considerations which pertain to no other part of the question of suffrage. The negro race had been recently emancipated; it was supposed that the antagonism between them and their old masters and the prejudice of race would be such as to obstruct the equal enjoyment of the rights of freedom conferred by the national forces, and would prevent the white race of the South from admitting the negro race, however deserving it might be, to equal political privileges. And, moreover, it was deemed by the North a point of honor that, having conferred freedom on the negro, he should be provided with the right of suffrage.

None of these considerations applies in the present case. It is not pretended that any such antagonism or prejudice exists between the sexes. It is not pretended that women have been redeemed from an intolerable slavery by the power of the government. It is not pretended that the sex in whose hands is the political power of the States is unwilling, from any cause, to do full justice to the other; for it is conceded that if the proposed amendment should be adopted, its incorporation into the constitution must result from the voluntary action of that sex in which is vested this political power. No good reason has been given why the congress of the United States should force or even hasten the States into such action, and no such reason can be given without a reversal of the theories on which our free institutions are based.

The history given by the majority, of the legislation of the several States in relation to the rights of persons and property of married women showing as it does a steady advance in the abolition of their common-law disabilities, conclusively demonstrates that this question may be safely left for solution where it now is and has always hitherto belonged. The public mind is now being agitated in many of the States as to the rights of women, not only as to suffrage, but as to their engaging in the various employments from which they have hitherto been excluded. This exclusion from certain employments has not been the result of municipal but of social laws—the strongest of all human regulations. As these social laws have been modified, so the sphere of woman's activities and usefulness has been enlarged. These social laws are in the main the groundwork of the exclusion of women from the right of suffrage. In the establishment of these laws, as in their modification, women their

Digitized by Google

selves have even a greater influence than men. Their disability to vote is, therefore, self-imposed; when they shall will otherwise, it is not too much to say that the disability will no longer exist. If in the future it shall be found that these laws deny a right to women the enjoyment of which they desire, and for the exercise of which they are qualified, it cannot be doubted that they will give way. If, on the contrary, neither of these shall be discovered, it will happen that the exclusion of suffrage will not be considered as a denial of a right, but as an exemption granted to women from cares and burdens which a tender and affectionate regard for womanhood refuses to cast on them.

We are convinced, therefore, that the best mode of disposing of the question is to leave its solution to that power most amenable to the influences and usages of society in which women have so large and so potential a share, confident that at no distant day a right result will be reached in each State which will be satisfactory to both sexes and perfectly consistent with the welfare and happiness of the people. Certainly this must be so if the people themselves, the source and foundation of all power, are capable of self-government.

At two of its meetings the committee listened with great pleasure to several eminent ladies who appeared before it as advocates of the proposed amendment. At none of the meetings of the committee, including that at which the members voted on the proposed amendment, was there any discussion of this important subject; none was asked for or desired by any member of the committee, and the vote was taken. The reports of the majority and of the minority of the committee are therefore to be construed only as the individual opinions of the members who respectively concur in them. They are in no sense to be treated as the judgment of a deliberative body charged with the examination of this important subject.

The foregoing leads us to but one recommendation: that the committee should be discharged from the further consideration of the subject, that the resolution raising it be rescinded, and that the proposed amendment be rejected.

J. Z. George,
Howell E. Jackson,
James G. Fair.

In a letter from Miss Caroline Biggs to the president of the National Association the following congratulations came from the friends of suffrage in England:

Central Committee of the National Society for Woman Suffrage, 64 Berners Street, London, W.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, on May 18, 1882, the following resolution was proposed by Mrs. Lucas, seconded by Miss Jane Cobden, and passed unanimously:

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of the National Society for Woman Suffrage have heard with hearty satisfaction that a select committee of the United States Senate in Washington has passed by a majority of votes the recommendation to adopt a constitutional amendment in favor of women's suffrage. They feel that the cause of woman is one in all countries, and they offer their most cordial congratulations to

the women of America on the important step which has just been gained, and their warmest good-wishes for a speedy success in obtaining a measure which will guarantee justice and equal rights to half the population of a sister country.

Nebraska now became the center of interest, as a constitutional amendment to secure the right of suffrage to woman was submitted to be voted upon in the November election. As the submission of such a proposition makes an important crisis in the history of a State, as well as in the suffrage movement, the notes of preparation were as varied as multitudinous throughout the nation, rousing all to renewed earnestness in the work. Both the American and National associations decided to hold their annual conventions in Omaha, the chief city of the State, and to support as many speakers * as possible through the campaign, that meetings might be held and tracts distributed in every county of the State, an Herculean undertaking, as Nebraska comprises 230,000 inhabitants scattered over an area of 76,000 square miles, divided into sixty-six counties; and yet this is what the friends of the measure proposed to do. The American Association † held its convention September 12, 13, 14. The National ‡ continued three days, September 27, 28, 29.

The Opera House, in which the National Association held its meeting, was completely filled during all the sessions. The address of welcome was given by Hon. A. J. Poppleton, one of the most distinguished lawyers in that State. He said:

I deem it no light compliment that, in the face of an explicit declaration that I am not in favor of woman suffrage, I have been asked to make, on behalf of the people of Omaha and the State, an address of welcome to the many distinguished men and women whom this occasion has brought together. Doubtless the consideration shown me is a recognition of the fact that I have been a life-long advocate of the advancement of women through the agencies of equality in education, equality in employment, equality in wages, equality in property-rights and personal liberty, in short, a fair, open, equal field in the struggle for life. That I cannot go beyond this and embrace equal suffrage, is due rather to long adherence

* The speakers in the American convention were Lucy Stone, Henry B. Blackwell, Margaret W. Campbell, Mary E. Haggart, Judge Kingman and Governor Hoyt of Wyoming, Hannah Tracy Cutler, Mary B. Clay, Dr. Mary F. Thomas, Rebecca N. Hazzard, Ada M. Bittenbender, Mrs. O. C. Dinsmore, Matilda Hindman, Rev. W. E. Copeland, Erasmus M. Correll.

The speakers at the National convention were Virginia L. Minor, Phœbe Couzins, Mrs. Saxon, Mrs. Bloomer, Mrs. McKinney, Mrs. Shattuck, Mrs. Neyman, Mrs. Colby, Mrs. Sewall, Mrs. Mason, Mrs. Brooks, Mrs. Blake, Miss Anthony, Mrs. Dinsmore, Miss Hindman, Mrs. Gougar, Mr. Correll and Mrs. Harbert. Many of those from both associations took part in the canvass. Miss Rachel G. Foster went out in the spring and made all the arrangements for the work of the National. She studied the geography of the State, and the railroads, and mapped out all the meetings for its twelve speakers.

† For full reports of the American convention see the *Woman's Journal*, edited by Lucy Stone and published in Boston.

‡ For reports of the National see *Our Herald*, edited by Helen M. Gougar and published in Lafayette, Ind. The daily papers of Omaha had full reports, the most fair by the *Republican*, edited by Mr. Brooks.

Digitized by Google

to the political philosophy of Edmund Burke than any lack of conviction of the absolute equality of men and women in natural rights.

In the winter of 1852–3, when a student at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., while the spot on which we now stand was Indian country as yet untouched by the formative power of national legislation, I listened to Miss Susan B. Anthony, Miss Antoinette Brown and others in the advocacy of the rights of women. It seems a strange fortune that brings now, nearly thirty years after, one of those speakers, crowned with a national reputation, into a State carved out of that Indian country and containing 60,000 people, in advocacy of equal suffrage for her sex. This single fact proclaims in thunder tones the bravery, the fidelity, the devotion of these pioneers of reform, and challenges for them the sympathy, respect, esteem and admiration of every good man and woman in America.

The thirty years commencing about 1850 have been prolific of momentous changes. It is the era of the sewing machine, of the domestication of steam and electricity, the overthrow of the great rebellion, the destruction of slavery, the consolidation of the German empire, the fall of the second Napoleon, the birth of the French republic, the incorporation of India into the British empire, and the revolution of commerce by the Pacific railways and the Suez canal. Great changes have likewise taken place in the structure of our own State and national legislation, the most conspicuous and pronounced result being the centralization of power in the federal government. It has been preëminently a period of amelioration, a long stride in the direction of tolerance of opinion, belief, speech and creed. Hospitals, asylums, schools, colleges and the manifold agencies of an advanced Christian civilization for alleviating the average lot of humanity, have grown and multiplied beyond the experience of former times, and men like Matthew Vassar, George Peabody and John Hopkins have hastened to consecrate the abundant fruits of honorable lives to the exaltation and advancement of the race.

But in no direction have greater changes occurred in this country than in the condition of woman in respect to employment, wages, personal and property rights. In all heathen countries at this hour the mass of women are slaves or worse, wholly deprived of civil rights. In most Christian countries their legal status is one of absolute subordination in person and property to men. In this republic alone have we attained an altitude where some small measure of justice is meted out to women by the laws. In 1850 a fair measure of her rights was the grim edict of the common law holding her in guardianship prior to marriage, and upon marriage making her and all her possessions practically the property of her husband, while a cruel, unreasonable and vicious public opinion excluded her from all except menial and ill-paid service. One by one and year by year these barriers have given way, until in many States her property and personal rights enjoy the complete shelter of the law. Now more than half the occupations and employments of this age of industrial activity and progress are thronged with the faithful, efficient and contented labor of women.

The law has broken forever the thraldom of an odious and hopeless marriage by reasonable laws for divorce for just cause, given her the cus-

Digitized by Google

tody of her children, vested her with the absolute power of disposition and control over her property, inherited or acquired, freed it from the claims of her husband's creditors, and clothed her with ample legal remedies even against her husband. Perhaps Nebraska alone of all the States, by its court of last resort, has upheld the power of the wife to make contracts with her husband and enforce them against him in her own name by the appropriate legal remedies. This surely is progress. Beyond this there lies but one field to win or fortress to reduce. Then surely the worn soldier in the long campaign crowned with the garlands of victory may rest from the battle.

Not many years ago, coming from Wisconsin, I think, a girl presented herself in the Illinois courts for admission to the bar, and after a rigid and unsparing examination she was admitted with public compliment. She took an office in the great city of Chicago and in the short remnant of an uncertain life so wrought in her profession as to attain an average professional income, and win the undivided respect and esteem of her professional associates. And when from a far country, whither she had gone in hope to escape a fell disease, her lifeless corpse was brought back for sepulture, many of the foremost lawyers of Chicago gathered about her bier and bore emphatic testimony to her virtues as a woman and her attainments as a lawyer. To me no greater work has been done by any American woman. When Alta Hulett unobtrusively, silently but indomitably pressed her way to the front of the legal profession, and established herself there, she vindicated the right of her sex to contend for the highest prizes of life, and left her countrywomen a legacy which will ultimately blazon her name imperishably in the history of the advancement of women; and every American woman who, like her, goes to the front of any honorable occupation, employment or profession, and stays there, becomes her coadjutor in work and a sharer in her reward.

Laden with the trophies of thirty years of conflict, of progress, of measurable success, the vice-president of the National Woman Suffrage Association and her associates present themselves to Nebraska and ask a hearing upon the final issue, "Shall this work be crowned by granting to women in this State the highest privilege of the citizen—suffrage?" On behalf of the people of a State whose legislature has granted everything else to women—whose devotion to free speech, untrammeled discussion and an independent press has been conspicuous in its constitutional and legislative history—I welcome them to this city and State, and bespeak for them a patient, candid, respectful, appreciative hearing.

Miss Anthony replied briefly to Mr. Poppleton's eloquent address and returned the thanks of the convention for the courtesy with which its members had been received by the citizens of Omaha.* She then read a letter from the president of the convention:

* Their many courtesies are well summed up by Miss Foster in a letter to *Our Herald*:—DEAR HERALD: As your readers will know from the report of the executive meetings, it was decided to have a headquarters for National Woman Suffrage Association speakers at Omaha. When your editor left, the arrangements had not been completed for office-room and furnishings. It is finally de-

Digitized by Google

TOULOUSE, France, September 1, 1882.

To the National Woman Suffrage Association in Convention assembled:

DEAR FRIENDS: People never appreciate the magnitude and importance on any step in progress, at the time it is taken, nor the full moral worth of the characters who inspire it, hence it will be in line with the whole history of reform from the beginning if woman's enfranchisement in Nebraska should in many minds seem puerile and premature, and its advocates fanatical and unreasonable. Nevertheless the proposition speaks for itself. A constitutional amendment to crown one-half of the people of a great State with all their civil and political rights, is the most vital question the citizens of Nebraska have ever been called on to consider; and the fact cannot be gainsaid that some of the purest and ablest women America can boast, are now in the State advocating the measure.

For the last two months I have been assisting my son in the compilation of a work soon to be published in America, under the title, "The Woman Question in Europe," to which distinguished women in different nations have each contributed a sketch of the progress made in their condition. One interesting and significant fact as shown in this work, is, that in the very years we began to agitate the question of equal rights, there was a simultaneous movement by women for various privileges, industrial, social, educational, civil and political, throughout the civilized world. And this without the slightest concert of action, or knowledge of each other's existence, showing that the time had come in the natural evolution of the species, in the order of human development, for woman to

---

cided that I, as secretary of the National Woman's Suffrage Association, remain in charge of this Omaha office, with Mrs. C. B. Colby as my associate, while Mrs. Bittenbender has charge of the headquarters at Lincoln, and manages the American and State speakers, these two officers of the campaign committee being in constant consultation.

I cannot too strongly express the gratitude which our committee, and especially our National Woman's Suffrage Association, owes to the kind firm of Kitchen Brothers, proprietors of the Paxton Hotel. During our late convention their attention has been unremitting, and they now crown it by giving us, rent free, a large, well-lighted office to be occupied until election as the Omaha headquarters of our campaign committee. I was somewhat puzzled about the suitable furnishings for the room, but Mr. Kitchen told me he would attend to that himself, and through his kindness it will be made very comfortable for us to occupy for the next five weeks.

Messrs. Dewey and Stone of this city, large dealers in furniture, have given the use of a handsome and convenient desk which will enable us to bring order out of chaos. So you can imagine us, surrounded by all convenient appliances, hard at work in our new quarters a good part of every day for this last month before election. We can certainly not complain that we are not made welcome to the best the city affords by these kind citizens of Omaha. Why, we even had a special engine and car given us by the accommodating manager of the Burlington & Missouri railroad to run one of our speakers from Omaha to Lincoln to enable her to attend a meeting which would otherwise have lacked a speaker. Mr. Montmorency, on behalf of the Burlington & Missouri railroad, extended this courtesy (and in our need at that hour it was highly appreciated) to us because of the work in which we are engaged. As all know ere this, both this road and the Union Pacific have given to our speakers and delegates generous reductions over all their lines in this State.

Mayor Boyd, owner of the Opera House, has also done his share to aid us toward success, in his great reduction of ordinary rates to us while we occupy his handsome building with our suffrage mass meetings. We have the Opera House now secured for October 4, 13, 19, 26, November 2 and 6, on which dates large meetings will be addressed by some of our principal speakers. The first date is to be filled by Miss Phœbe Couzins, on "The Woman Without a Country."

The full report of our proceedings at the Omaha and Lincoln conventions, with the newspaper comments upon the size and character of the audiences there assembled, as well as the courtesies which I have just mentioned, will convince our readers that we are seemingly welcome guests here in Nebraska, and I may say especially in Omaha. I will keep the *Herald* posted from week to week upon campaign committee work. Yours for success, RACHEL G. FOSTER.

Headquarters of Suffrage Campaign Committee, Paxton House, Omaha, October 2, 1882.

Digitized by Google

assert her rights, and to demand the recognition of the feminine element in all the vital interests of life.

To battle against a palpable fact in philosophy and the accumulated facts in achievement that can be seen on all sides in woman's work for the last forty years, from slavery to equality, is as vain as to fight against the law of gravitation. We shall as surely reach the goal we purposed when we started, as that the rich prairies of Nebraska will ere long feed and educate millions of brave men and women, gathered from every nation on the globe. Every consideration for the improvement of your home life, for the morality of your towns and cities, for the elevation of your schools and colleges, and the loftiest motives of patriotism should move you, men of Nebraska, to vote for this amendment. Galton in his great work on Heredity says:

> We are in crying want of a greater fund of ability in all stations of life, for neither the classes of statesmen, philosophers, artisans nor laborers, are up to the modern complexity of their several professions. An extended civilization like ours comprises more interests than the ordinary statesmen or philosophers of our race are capable of dealing with, and it exacts more intelligent work than our ordinary artisans and laborers, are capable of performing. Our race is overweighted, and appears likely to be dragged into degeneracy by demands that exceed its powers. If its average ability were raised a grade or two, a new class of statesmen would conduct our complex affairs at home and abroad, as easily as our best business men now do their own private trades and professions. The needs of centralization, communication, and culture, call for more brains and mental stamina, than the average of our race possesses.

Does it need a prophet to tell us where to begin this work? Does not the physical and intellectual condition of the women of a nation decide the capacity and power of its men? If we would give our sons the help and inspiration of woman's thought and interest in the complex questions of our present civilization, we must first give her the power that political responsibility secures. With the ballot in her own right hand, she would feel a new sense of dignity, and command among men a respect they have never felt before.

Nebraska has now the opportunity of making this grand experiment of securing justice, liberty, equality, for the first time in the world's history, to woman, through her education and enfranchisement, of lifting man to that higher plane of thought where he may be able wisely to meet all the emergencies of the period in which he is called on to act. Let every man in Nebraska now so do his duty, that, when the sun goes down on the eighth of November, the glad news may be sent round the world that at last one State in the American republic has fully accorded the sacred right of self-government to all her citizens, black and white, men and women. With sincere hope for this victory,

Cordially yours, ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

Many interesting letters were received from friends at home and abroad, of which we give a few. The following is from our Minister Plenipotentiary at the German Court:

BERLIN, September 9, 1882.

Miss ANTHONY: *Esteemed Friend:* At this great distance I can only sympathize with the earnest effort to be made this fall to secure poli-

Digitized by Google

tical recognition for women in Nebraska. I am glad that the prospect is so good and that Nebraska, which gave a name, with Kansas, to the first successful resistance to the encroachments of slavery, is the arena where the battle is to be fought under such promise of a just result. By recognizing the right of its women to an equal share in all the duties and responsibilities of life, Nebraska will honor itself while securing for all time wholesome laws and administration.

I believe society would more benefit itself than grant a favor to women by extending the suffrage to them. All the interests of women are promoted by a government that shall guard the family circle, restrain excess, promote education, shield the young from temptation. While the true interests of men lie in the same direction, women more generally appreciate these facts and illustrate in their lives a desire for their attainment. Could we bring to the ballot-box the great fund of virtue, intelligence and good intention stored up in the minds and hearts of our wives and sisters, how great the reinforcement would be for all that is noble, patriotic and pure in public life! Who should fear the result who desires the public welfare? From the stand-point of better principles applied to the direction of public affairs and the best individuals in office, the argument seems impregnable.

It is getting late to resist this measure on the ground that the character of women themselves would be lowered by contact with politics. That objection is identical with the motive which causes the Turk to shut up his women in a harem and closely veil them in public. He fears their delicacy will be tarnished if they speak to any man but their proprietor. So prejudice feared woman would be unsexed if she had equal education with man. The professions were closed to women for the same consideration. Women have vindicated their ability to endure the education and engage in the dreaded pursuits, yet society is not dissolved, and these fearful imaginings have proved idle dreams. As every advance made by woman since the days when it was a mooted law-point how large could be the stick with which her husband could punish her, down to the day when congress opened to her the bar of the United States Supreme Court, has been accompanied by constantly refuted assertions that she and society were about to be ruined. I think we can safely trust to her good sense, virtue and delicacy to preserve for us the loved and venerated object we have always known, even if society shall yield the still further measure of complete enfranchisement, and thus add to her social dignity, duties and responsibilities.

No class has ever been degraded by the ballot. All have rather been elevated by it. We cannot rationally anticipate less desirable personal consequences to those whose tendencies are naturally good, than to those on whom the ballot has been conferred belonging to a lower plane of being. But these considerations go only to show the policy of granting suffrage to women. From the stand-point of justice the argument is more pressing. If woman asks for the ballot shall man deny it? By what right? Certainly not by the right of a majority; for women are at least as numerous. Certainly not by any right derived from nature; for our common mother has set no brand on woman. If one woman shall ask

Digitized by Google

for a voice in the regulation of society of which she is at least one-half, who shall say her nay? If any woman shall ask it, who shall deny it because another woman does not ask it? There are many men who do not value their citizenship; shall other men therefore be deprived of the ballot? Suppose many women would not avail themselves of such a function, are those with higher, or other views, to be therefore kept in tutelage?

I trust you may succeed in this work in Nebraska. It is of supreme importance to the cause. The example of Nebraska would soon be followed by other States. The current of such a reform knows no retiring ebb. The suffrage once acquired will never be relinquished; first, because it will recommend itself, as it has in Wyoming, by its results; second, because the women will jealously guard their rights, and defend them with their ballots. Wishing I could do more than send you good wishes for the cause,* I am, respectfully yours, A. A. SARGENT.

The following letter is from a daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton (a graduate of Vassar College, and classmate of Miss Elizabeth Poppleton), who two years before, on the eve of her departure for Europe, gave her eloquent address on Edmund Burke in that city:

TOULOUSE, France, September 3, 1882.

To the Voters of my Generation in Nebraska:

It is not my desire to present to you any argument, but only to give you an episode in my own life. I desire to lay before you a fact, not a fiction; a reality, not a supposition; an experience not a theory.

I was born in a free republic and in my veins runs very rebellious blood. An ancestor of my father was one of those intrepid men who left the shores of old England and sailed forth to establish on a distant continent the grandest republic that has ever yet been known. That, you see, is not good blood to submit to injustice. And on my mother's side we find a sturdy old Puritan from whom our stock is traced, fleeing from England because of the faith that was in him, and joining his rebellious life to one of that honest Holland nation which had defied so nobly the oppressions of the Catholic church and Spanish inquisition. As if this were not sufficiently independent blood to pass on to other generations, my own father became an abolitionist, and step by step fought his belief to victory, and my mother early gave her efforts to the elevation of woman. It is all this, together with my living in the freëst land on the globe and in a century rife with discussions of all principles of government, that has made me in every fiber a believer in republican institutions.

Having been reared in a large family of boys where we enjoyed equal freedom, and having received the same collegiate education as my brothers, it is not until lately that I have felt the crime of my womanhood. I have dwelt thus upon the antecedents and influences of my life in order to ask you one question: Do you not think I can appreciate the real meaning, the true sacredness of a republic? Do you not believe I feel

* A private letter was received from Mrs. Ellen Clark Sargent, enclosing a check for $50.

Digitized by Google

the duties it demands of its citizens? But I want you to hold your reply in abeyance, till I give you one bit more of history.

A ship at sea crossing on the Atlantic between Europe and America. Of two persons on this vessel I wish to speak to you. Of one I have already told you much; I need but add that my two years spent in Europe,* previous to my return to America for a few months last winter, had not made me less American, less a lover of republicanism. And now this ship, baffling the February storm, was sweeping nearer the land where the people reign. My heart beat high as I thought it was in my native country where women were free, more honored than in any nation in the world. As I stood on the deck, the strong sea-wind blowing wildly about me, and the ocean bearing on its heart-wave mountains, visions of the grandeur of the nation lying off beyond the western horizon, rose before me. And it was a proud heart that cried—"My Country!"

And the other person I want to speak of? It is a man, a German, coming to the United States to escape military service in Prussia. He came in the steerage; was poor and ignorant. He could speak no English, not one word of your language and mine. His fellows were all Irish, so I offered to be an interpreter for him. I visited the steerage quarters, and returned with a heavy heart. Such brutal faces as I saw! Ignorance, cruelty, subserviency, were everywhere depicted. Herds of human beings that I feared, they looked so dull and brutal. The full meaning of a terrible truth rushed upon me. Soon these men would be my sovereigns—I their subject!

I had just spent a year in that German's native land, and I remembered that I had seen their women doing the work of men in the fields, husbands returning from their day's labor empty-handed, and their wives toiling on behind bent under heavy burdens, and as I thought on this, our ship bore him and me towards the land that glories in having given birth to Lucretia Mott. In the country where he had been reared, I had seen women harnessed with beasts of burden, dragging laden wagons, and yet our vessel carried him and me at each moment towards a safe harbor, in a land that pays homage to the memory of Margaret Fuller. Our ship sailed on, taking him from a land where he had been taught to worship royalty, whatever its worth or crime; where he had paid cringing submission to an arbitrary rule of police; where he had been surrounded by the degrading effects of the mightiest military system on the globe. The ship plowed on and on through the waves, bringing him to a republic, not one principle of which he comprehended.

And now we sail up New York bay. The day is bright, and a softening haze hangs over all. Surely this is some vision-land. Yes, it is indeed a vision-land, for it has never known the presence of a royal line; against its oppressors it fought in no mean rebellious spirit, but rose in revolution with its motto, "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," written on its brow to be known of all men. And I

* Miss Stanton, having studied astronomy with Professor Maria Mitchell, went to Europe to take a degree in Mathematics from the College of France; but before completing her course, she shared the fate of too many of our American girls; she expatriated herself by marrying a foreigner.

Digitized by Google

think as we slowly sail up the bay on our vessel, Does that deadened soul respond to what lies before him? Does there in his heart rise the prayer, Oh, God! make me true to the duties about to be laid upon me; make me worthy of being free? Yes, then, for the first time I felt the full depth of the indignity offered to my womanhood. I felt my enthusiasm for America wavering—love of country dead. *My* country!—I have no country.

Young men of Nebraska, I ask you to free your minds from prejudice, to be just towards the demands of another human soul, to be frank, to be wholly truthful, and answer my demand: Why should I not be a citizen of this republic? In replying, read between the lines of my tedious story and bear in mind the words of Voltaire: "Who would dare change a law that time has consecrated? Is there anything more respectable than an ancient abuse! Reason is more ancient, replied Zadig."

Respectfully, HARRIOT STANTON.

MANCHESTER NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE,
MANCHESTER, England, September 5, 1882.

DEAR MISS ANTHONY: Will you accept a word of cheer and God-speed from your sisters in England in your crusade for the emancipation of woman in Nebraska? You carry with you the hopes and sympathetic wishes of all on this side of the water. If you win, as I trust you may, your victory will have a distinct influence on the future of our parliamentary campaign, which we hope to begin in early spring in England. In the name of English women I would appeal to the men of Nebraska to assent to the great act of justice to women which is proposed to them by their elected representatives, and by so doing to aid in the enfranchisement of women all over the world.

Yours faithfully, LYDIA E. BECKER.

LONDON, September 1, 1882.

DEAR MISS ANTHONY: Having heard that the next convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association will meet at Omaha this month, I cannot refrain from sending a few lines to assure our friends who are working so steadfastly in America for the same sacred cause as our own, of our loving sympathy and good-wishes for success in the coming struggle. The eyes and hearts of hundreds of women are, like my own, turned to Nebraska, where so momentous an issue is to be decided two months hence. The news of their vote, if rightly given, will "echo round the world" like the first shot fired at Concord. It will be the expression of their determination to establish their freedom by giving freedom to others, and their example will be followed by Indiana and Oregon, and soon by the other States of the Union and by England. Everything points with us to a speedy triumph of the principle of equal justice for woman. Next November, about the time when Nebraska will be voting for equal suffrage, the women in Scotland will be voting for the first time in their municipal elections. The session of 1882 will be memorable in future for having passed the act which gives a married woman the right to hold her own property, make contracts, sue and be sued, in the same manner as if she were a single woman. It is nearly thirty years since we

Digitized by Google

first began our efforts in this matter, and each succeeding step has been won very slowly and with great difficulty through the efforts of those who are working to obtain the suffrage. Mr. Gladstone still expresses the hope that next session will place the franchise on a "fair" basis, meaning thereby the same right of voting for counties as for boroughs. We maintain that the franchise can never be said to be on a fair basis while women are debarred from the right of voting. Our progress and your progress will keep even pace together, for if women are free in America no long time can elapse before they are free here. We can but offer you our sympathy and we beg this favor of you, that as soon as you have the returns of the vote ascertained, you will telegraph the news to us, that our English societies may keep the day of rejoicing heart in heart with the American National Association.

With cordial sympathy in all your efforts, I am, faithfully yours,

CAROLINE ASHURST BIGGS.

To the National Woman Suffrage Association, in Convention assembled, at Omaha, Nebraska, September 26, 27, 28:

DEAR FRIENDS: The most pressing work before the National Woman Suffrage Convention, is bringing all its forces to bear upon congress for the submission of a sixteenth amendment to the national constitution, which shall prohibit States from disfranchising citizens of the United States, on the ground of sex, or for any cause not equally applicable to all citizens. While we of the National are glad to see an amendment to a State constitution proposed, securing suffrage to woman, as is the case in Nebraska this fall, we must not be led by it to forget or neglect our legitimate work, an amendment to the national constitution, which will secure suffrage at one and the same moment to the women of each State. While all action of any kind and everywhere is good because it is educational, the only real, legitimate work of the National Woman Suffrage Association, is upon congress. Never have our prospects been brighter than to-day. A select committee on woman suffrage having been appointed in both houses during the last session of congress, and a resolution introduced in the Senate, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to secure the right of suffrage to all citizens irrespective of sex, having been referred to this select committee and receiving a favorable majority report thereon, we have every reason to expect the submission of such an amendment at the next session of congress.

The work then, most necessary, is with each representative and senator; and the legislatures of the several States should be induced to pass resolutions requesting the senators and representatives from each State to give voice and vote in favor of the submission of such an amendment. This work is vitally important for the coming winter, and none the less so, even should Nebraska vote aye November 7, upon the woman suffrage amendment to its own constitution. In view of the probability of the submission of a sixteenth amendment at the coming session of congress, I offer the following resolution, which I consider one of the most important of the series I have been asked to prepare for adoption by the convention:

Digitized by Google

Resolved, That it is the duty of every woman to work with the legislature of her own State, to secure from it the passage of a joint resolution requesting its senators and representatives in congress to use voice and vote in favor of the submission of an amendment to the national constitution which shall prohibit States from disfranchising citizens on the ground of sex.

I hope the above resolution will be unanimously adopted, and that each woman will strive to carry its provisions into effect as a religious duty. With my best wishes for a grand and successful convention, and the hope that Nebraska will set itself right before the world by the adoption of the woman suffrage amendment this fall, I am,

Very truly yours, MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE.*

The Republican in describing the closing scenes of the convention, said:

Fully 2,500 people assembled last evening to listen to the closing proceedings of the convention. The stage, which was beautifully furnished and upholstered, was completely occupied by the ladies of the Association; and as they all were in full dress, in preparation for the reception at the Paxton Hotel, the sight was a brilliant one. As respects the audience, not only the seats, but the lobbies were crowded, and hundreds upon hundreds were turned away. Manager Boyd remarked as we passed in, "You will see to-night the most magnificent gathering that has ever been in the Opera House," and such truly it was—the intellect, fashion and refinement of the city. Addresses were given by M'me Neyman, whose earnest and eloquent words were breathlessly heard; Mrs. Minor of St. Louis, whose utterances were serious and weighty; and Miss Phœbe Couzins, who touched the springs of sentiment, sympathy, pathos and humor by turns. After answering two or three objections that had not been fully touched upon, Miss Couzins fairly carried away the house, when she said in conclusion, "Miss Anthony and myself, and another who has addressed you are the only spinsters in the movement. We, indeed, expect to marry, but we don't want our husbands to marry slaves [great merriment]; we are waiting for our enfranchisement. And now, if you want Miss Anthony and myself to move into your State—" this hit, with all it implied, set the audience into a convulsion of cheers and laughter which was quite prolonged; and after the merriment had subsided, Miss Couzins completed her sentence by saying, "We are under sailing orders to receive proposals!" whereupon the applause broke out afresh. "However," she added, seeing Miss Anthony shake her head, "it takes a very superior woman to be an old maid, and on this principle I think Miss Anthony will stick to her colors." Miss Couzins quoted Hawthorne as speaking through "Zenobia":

"It is my belief, yea, my prophecy, that when my sex shall have attained its freedom there will be ten eloquent women where there is now one eloquent man," and instanced this convention as an illustration of what might be expected.

* Letters were also received from Rebecca Moore, England; Mrs. Z. G. Wallace, Indianapolis; Frederick Douglass, Washington, D. C.; Theodore Stanton, Paris, France; Sarah Knox Goodrich, Clarina Howard Nichols, California, and many others.

Digitized by Google

Miss Couzins was followed by Mrs. Saxon, Mrs. Neyman and Miss Hindman. The resolutions,* which were presented by Mrs. Sewall, among their personal commendations expressed the appreciation of the Association for the services rendered by Mrs. Clara Bewick Colby, in making preparations for the convention. Mrs. Colby in making her acknowledgments said:

There was another to whom the Association owed much for the work done which has made possible the brilliant success of the convention—one to whom, while across the water their thoughts and hearts had often turned; and she was sure that all present would gladly join in extending a welcome to the late president, and now chairman of the executive committee of the State association, Mrs. Harriet S. Brooks.

Mrs. Brooks came forward amid applause, and said:

That at this late hour while a speech might be silvern, silence was golden; and she would say no more than, on behalf of all the members and officers of the State association, and the friends of the cause in Omaha, to tender their most grateful thanks to the National Association for "the feast of reason and the flow of soul" with which they have been favored during the last three days.

At the close of the convention the spacious parlors of the Paxton House were crowded. Over a thousand ladies and gentlemen passed through, shaking hands with the delegates and congratulating them on the great success of the convention.

Another enthusiastic meeting was held at Lincoln, the capital of the State, and radiating from this point in all directions these missionaries of the new gospel of woman's equality traversed the entire State, scattering tracts and holding meetings in churches, school-houses and the open air, and thus the agitation was

* WHEREAS, The National Woman Suffrage Association has labored unremittingly to secure the appointment of a committee in the congress of the United States to receive and consider the petitions of women and whereas, this Association realizes the importance of such a committee,

Resolved, That the thanks of this Association are due and are hereby tendered to congress for the appointment at its last session of a Select Woman Suffrage Committee in each house.

Resolved, That the thanks of this Association are hereby tendered to Senators Lapham, Ferry, Blair and Anthony, of the Select Committee, for their able majority report.

Resolved, That it is the paramount duty of congress at its next session to submit a sixteenth amendment to the constitution which shall secure the enfranchisement of the women of the republic.

Resolved, That the recent action of King Christian of Denmark, in conferring the right of municipal suffrage upon the women in Iceland, and the similar enlargement of woman's political freedom in Scotland, India and Russia, are all encouraging evidences of the progress of self-government even in monarchical countries. And farther, that while the possession of these privileges by our foreign sisters is an occasion of rejoicing to us, it still but emphasizes the inconsistency of a republic which refuses political recognition to one-half of its citizens.

Resolved, That the especial thanks of the officers and delegates of this convention are due and are hereby most cordially tendered to Mrs. Clara Bewick Colby, for the exceptionally efficient manner in which she has discharged the onerous duties which devolved upon her in making all preparations for this convention and for the grand success which her efforts have secured.

Resolved, That the National Woman Suffrage Association on the occasion of this, its fourteenth annual convention, does, in the absence of its honored president, desire to send greeting to Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and to express to her the sympathetic admiration with which the members of this body have followed her in her reception in a foreign land.

kept up until the day of election. As it was the season for agricultural fairs, the people were more easily drawn together, and the ladies readily availed themselves, as they had opportunity, of these great gatherings. Two notable debates were held in Omaha in answer to the many challenges sent by the opposition. Miss Couzins, the first to enter the arena, was obliged to help her antagonist in his scriptural quotations, while Miss Anthony was compelled to supply hers with well-known statistics. It was evident that neither of the gentlemen had sharpened his weapons for the encounter.

To look over the list of counties visited and the immense distances traveled in public and private conveyances, enables one in a measure to appreciate the physical fatigue these ladies endured. In reading of their earnest speeches, debates, conversations at every fireside and dinner-table, in every car and carriage as they journeyed by the way or waited at the station, their untiring perseverance must command the unqualified admiration of those who know what a political campaign involves. During those six weeks of intense excitement they were alike hopeful and anxious as to the result. At last the day dawned when the momentous question of the enfranchisement of 75,000 women was to be decided. Every train brought some of the speakers to their headquarters in Omaha, with cheering news from the different localities they had canvassed. And now one last effort must be made, they must see what can be done at the polls. Some of the ladies went in carriages to each of the polling booths and made earnest appeals to those who were to vote for or against the woman's amendment. Others stood dispensing refreshments and the tickets they wished to see voted, all day long. And while the men sipped their coffee and ate their viands with evident relish, the women appealed to their sense of justice, to their love of liberty and republican institutions. Vain would be the attempt to describe the patient waiting, the fond hopes, the bright visions of coming freedom, that had nerved these brave women to these untiring labors, or to shadow in colors dark enough the fears, the anxieties, the disappointments, all centered in that November election. A fitting subject for an historical picture was that group of intensely earnest women gathered there, as the last rays of the setting sun warned them that whether for weal or for woe the decisive hour had come; no word of theirs could turn defeat to victory.

The hours of anxious waiting were not long, the verdict soon came flashing on every wire, from the north, the south, the west: "No!" "No!" "No!" The mothers, wives and daughters of Nebraska must still wear the yoke of slavery; they who endured with man the hardships of the early days and bravely met the dangers of a pioneer life, they who have reared two generations of boys and taught them the elements of all they know, who have stood foremost in all good works of charity and reform, who appreciate the genius of free institutions, native-born American citizens, are still to be governed by the ignorant, vicious classes from the old world. What a verdict was this for one of the youngest States in the American republic in the nineteenth century!

But these heroic women did not sit down in sackcloth and ashes to weep over the cruel verdict. Anticipating victory, they had engaged the Opera House to hold their jubilee if the women of Nebraska were enfranchised; or, if the returns brought them no cause for rejoicing, they would at least exalt the educational work that had been done in the State, and dedicate themselves anew to this struggle for liberty. They had survived three defeats, in Kansas, Michigan, Colorado, and tasted the bitterness of repeated disappointments, and another could not crush them. When the hour arrived, an immense audience welcomed them in the Opera House, and from this new baptism of sorrow they spoke more eloquently than ever before. In their calm, determined manner they seemed to say with Milton's hero:

"All is not lost: the unconquerable will is ours."

A report of the Fifteenth Annual Washington Convention, Jan. 23, 24, 25, 1883, was written by Miss Jessie Waite of Chicago, and published in the *Washington Chronicle*, from which we give the following extracts:

The proceedings of the Association were inaugurated at Lincoln Hall Monday evening by a novel lecture, entitled "Zekle's Wife," by Mrs. Amy Talbot Dunn of Indianapolis. The personality of Mrs. Dunn is so entirely lost in that of Zekle's wife that it is hard to realize that the old lady of so many and so varied experiences is a happy young wife. As a character sketch Mrs. Dunn's "Zekle's Wife" stands on an equality with Denman Thompson's "Joshua Whitcomb" and with Joe Jefferson's "Rip Van Winkle." To sustain a conception so foreign to the natural characteristics of the actor without once allowing the interest of the audience to flag, requires originality of thought, independence of idea, and genius for action. Mrs. Dunn, herself the author of her sketch, possesses to a re-

markable degree the power to impress upon her audience the feeling that the old lady from "Kaintuck" is before them, not only to say things for their amusement, but also to impress upon them those great truths which have presented themselves to her mind during the fifty years of her married life. "Zekle's Wife" is a keen, shrewd, warm-hearted, lovable old woman, without education or culture, yet with an innate sense of refinement and a touching undercurrent of desire "not to be too hard on Zekle." As she tells her story, which she informs us is a true one from real life, she engages the attention and wins the sympathy of all her hearers, and frequent bursts of applause evidence the satisfaction of the audience.

The convention proper opened on Tuesday morning with the appointment of various committees,* and reports † from the different States filled up most of the time during the day. May Wright Sewall said:

Women must learn that power gives power; that intelligence alone can appreciate or be influenced by intelligence; that justice alone is moved by appeals based on justice. More than anything in the course of suffrage labor does the Nebraska campaign justify the primary method of this National Association. We have a right to expect that each legislature will be composed of the picked men of the State. We have a right to believe that as the intelligence, wisdom and justice of the picked men of the nation are superior to the same qualities in the mass of men, so is the fitness of national and State legislators to consider the demands for the ballot.

Mrs. Mills of Washington sang, as a solo, "Barbara Fritchie," in excellent style. Mrs. Caroline Hallowell Miller (wife of Francis Miller, esq., late assistant attorney for the District of Columbia) spoke with the greatest ease and most remarkable command of language. She is in every sense a strong woman. She said that, born and reared as she was in a Virginia town noted for its intense conservatism, where she had seen a woman stripped to the waist and brutally beaten by order of the law (her skin happened to be of a dark color) whose only crime was that of alleged impertinence, and that impertinence provoked by improper conduct on the part of a young man; that, reared in such a cradle as this, still, through the blessing of a good home, she had learned to deeply appreciate the noble efforts of women who dared to tread new paths, to break their own way through the dense forest of prejudice and ignorance. Man cannot represent woman. If woman breaks any law of man, of nature, or of God, she alone must suffer the penalty. "This fact seems to me," said Mrs. Miller, "to settle the whole question."

Miss Anthony read the following letter from Hon. Benjamin F. Butler, who, she said, had the honor of being an advocate of this cause, in addition to being governor of Massachusetts:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 23, 1883.

MY DEAR MISS ANTHONY: I received your kind note asking me to attend the National Convention of the friends of woman suffrage at Washington, for which courtesy I am obliged. My engagements, which have taken me out of the commonwealth, cover all, and more than all, of my time, and I find I am to hurry back, leav-

* Committee on Resolutions, composed of Lillie Devereux Blake of New York city, Virginia L. Minor of St. Louis, Harriet R. Shattuck of Boston, May Wright Sewall of Indianapolis, and Ellen H. Sheldon of the District of Columbia.

† Mrs. Spofford, the treasurer, reported that $5,000 were spent in Nebraska in the endeavor to carry the amendment in that State.

Digitized by Google

ing some of them undisposed of. It will therefore be impossible for me to attend the convention.

As I have already declared my conviction that the fourteenth amendment fully covers the right of all persons to vote, and as I assume that the women of the country are persons, and very important persons to its happiness and prosperity, I never have been able to see any reason why women do not come within its provisions. I think such will be the decision of the court, perhaps quite as early as you may be able to get through congress and the legislatures of the several States another amendment. But both lines of action may well be followed, as they do not conflict with each other. This course was taken in the case of the fifteenth amendment, which was supposed to be necessary to cover the case of the negro, although many of the friends of the colored man looked coldly upon that amendment, because it seemed to be an admission that the fourteenth amendment was not sufficient. Therefore I can without inconsistency, I think, bid you "God speed" in your agitation for the sixteenth amendment. It will have the effect to enlighten the public mind as to the scope of the fourteenth amendment. I am very truly, your friend and servant, BENJ. F. BUTLER.

Mrs. Blake presented a series of resolutions, which were laid on the table for consideration:

WHEREAS, In larger numbers than ever before the women of the United States are demanding the repeal of arbitrary restrictions which now debar them from the use of the ballot; and

WHEREAS, The recent defeat in Nebraska of a constitutional amendment, giving the women of the State the right to vote, proves that failure is the natural result of an appeal to the masses on a question which is best understood and approved by the more intelligent citizens; therefore,

Resolved, That we call upon this congress to pass, without delay, the sixteenth amendment to the federal constitution now pending in the Senate.

Resolved, That all competitive examinations for places in the civil service of the United States should be open on equal terms to citizens of both sexes, and that any so-called civil service reform that does not correct the existing unjust discrimination against women employés, and grade all salaries on merit and not sex, is a dishonest pretense at reform.

WHEREAS, The Constitution of the United States declares that no State shall be admitted to the Union unless it have a republican form of government; and whereas, no true republic can exist unless all the inhabitants are given equal civil and political rights; therefore,

Resolved, That we earnestly protest against the admission of Dakota as a State, unless the right of suffrage is secured on equal terms to all her citizens.

Resolved, That the women of these United States have not deserved the infliction of this punishment of disfranchisement, and do most earnestly demand that they be relieved from the cruelties it imposes upon them.

WHEREAS, During the war hundreds of women throughout our land entered the service of the nation as hospital nurses; and

WHEREAS, Many of these women were disabled by wounds and by disease, while many were reduced to permanent invalidism by the hardships they endured; therefore,

Resolved, That these women should be placed on the pension list and rewarded for their services.

After the reading of the resolutions an animated discussion followed, Miss Anthony showing in scathing terms the injustice of the employment of women to do equal work with men at half the salaries, in the departments at Washington and elsewhere. An additional resolution was adopted declaring that paying Dr. Susan A. Edson for her services as attendant physician to President Garfield, $1,000 less than was paid for

Digitized by Google

an equivalent service rendered by Dr. Boynton, a more recent graduate of the same college from which she received her diploma, is an unjust discrimination on account of sex.

Mrs. SEWALL said men in the departments were given extra leave of absence each year to go home to vote, and suggested that women be given (until the time comes for them to vote) extra leave to meditate upon the ballot.

Miss ANTHONY said she had addressed a letter to each secretary asking that such women as desired be given permission to attend the meetings of this convention without loss of time to them. She had received but one answer, which was from Secretary Folger, who wrote: "*The condition of the public business prevents us from acceding to your request.*"

Mrs. HARRIETTE R. SHATTUCK of Boston said: Tired as some of the audience must be of hearing the same old argument in favor of the ballot for women repeated from year to year, they could not possibly be more tired than the friends of the cause were of hearing the same old objections repeated from year to year. While the forty-year-old objections are raised the forty-year-old rejoinders must be given. We must continue to agitate until we force people to listen. It is like the ringing of a bell. At first no one notices it; in a little while, a few will listen; finally, the perpetual ding-dong, ding-dong, will force itself to be heard by every one. The oldest of all the old arguments is that of right and justice, and the tune which my little bell shall ring is merely this: "*It is right!*" This cry of woman for liberty and equality increases every day, and it is a cry that must some day be heard and responded to.

Mrs. Virginia L. Minor of St. Louis was then introduced as the woman who stands to this cause in the same relation that Dred Scott had stood to the Republican party. Miss Couzins said that in introducing Mrs. Minor she wanted to say one word about the work Mrs. Minor had done for the soldiers, during the sanitary fair and all through the war. She had canned fruit, refusing the money offered in payment, returning it all to be used for the sick and wounded soldiers [applause]. Mrs. Minor spoke in a calm, deliberate manner, with perfect conviction in the truth of her statements and with a winning sweetness of expression that indicated the highest sensibilities of a refined nature. She showed that women voted in the early days of the country, and that undoubtedly it was the intention of the framers of the constitution that they should do so. This right had been taken away when the constitution was amended and the word "male" inserted. What is now desired is simply restoration of that which had been taken away. She believed that this restoration was made, unwittingly, by the addition of the fourteenth amendment, which, without doubt, makes women citizens. It is men who have abused the republican institution of suffrage; it is women who desire to restore it to its proper exercise. Miss Anthony read a letter from Mrs. Wallace, the wife of one of the former governors of Indiana:

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., January 21, 1883.

DEAR MISS ANTHONY: When in the call I read that for fourteen consecutive years the National Woman Suffrage Association had held a convention in Washington, I was oppressed by two thoughts: First, how hard it is to overcome prejudice and ignorance when they have been fortified by the usages and customs of ages; and secondly, the sublime faith, courage and perseverance of the advocates of woman's enfranchisement, and their confidence in the ultimate triumph of justice. After all, by what are governments organized and maintained? By brute force alone? Despotisms may be, but republics never. What are the qualifications for the ballot? The power to fight? Are they not rather intelligence, virtue, truth and patriotism? I scarce

Digitized by Google

think the most obstinate and egotistical of our opponents will assert that men possess a monopoly of these virtues, or even a moiety of them. As to their fighting capacities, of which we hear so much, I think they would have cut a sorry figure in the wars which they have been compelled to wage in order to establish and maintain this government, if they had not had the sympathy and coöperation of woman. I entirely agree with you that, while agitation in the States is necessary as a means of education, a sixteenth amendment to the national constitution is the quickest, surest and least laborious way to secure the success of this great work for human liberty. Any legislature of Indiana in the last six years would have ratified such an amendment. With highest regards for yourself and the best wishes for the success of the convention, I remain, Yours, etc., ZERELDA G. WALLACE.

After several other speakers,* Madame Clara Neyman of New York city, delivered what was, without question, one of the best addresses of the convention. She spoke with a slightly German accent, which only served to enhance the interest and hold the attention of the audience. Her eloquence and argument could not fail to convince all of her earnest purpose. After showing the philosophy of reform movements, and every step of progress, she said:

Woman's enfranchisement will be wrought out by peaceful means. We shall use no fire-arms, no torpedoes, no heavy guns to gain our freedom. No precious human lives will be sacrificed; no tears will be shed to establish our right. We shall capture the fortresses of prejudice and injustice by the force of our arguments; we shall send shell after shell into these strongholds until their defective reasoning gives way to victorious truth. "Inability to bear arms," says Herbert Spencer, "was the reason given in feudal times for excluding woman from succession," and to-day her position is lowest where the military spirit prevails. A sad illustration of this is my own country. Being a born German, and in feeling, kindred, and patriotism attached to the country of my birth and childhood, it is hard for me to make such a confession. But the truth must be told, even if it hurts. It has been observed by those who travel in Europe, that Germany, which has the finest and best universities, which stands highest in scholarship, nevertheless tolerates, nay, enforces the subjection of woman. The freedom of a country stands in direct relation to the position of its women. America, which has proclaimed the freedom of man, has developed *pari passu* a finer womanhood, and has done more for us than any other nation in existence. A new type of manhood has been reared on American soil—a type which Tennyson describes in his Princess:

> Man shall be more of woman, she of man;
> He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
> Nor lose the thews that wrestle with the world;
> She, mental breadth, nor fail in childward care,
> Nor lose the childlike in the larger mind;
> Till at the last they set them each to each,
> Like perfect music unto noble words.
> Then comes the statelier Eden back to man;
> Then springs the crowning race of human kind.

At the evening session the time was divided between Lillie Devereux Blake and Phœbe W. Couzins. Mrs. Blake spoke on the question, "Is it a Crime to be a Woman?"

She showed in a clear, logical manner that wherever a woman was apprehended for crime the discrimination against her was not because of the crime she had committed, but because the crime was committed by a woman. Every woman in this country is treated by the law as if she were to blame for being a woman. In New York an hon-

* Short speeches were made by Mrs. Rogers, Mrs. Lockwood, Mrs. McKinney, Mrs. Loder and others.

Digitized by Google

orable married woman has no right to her children. A man may beat his wife all he pleases; but if he beats another man the law immediately interferes, showing that the woman is not protected simply because she is so indiscreet as to *be a woman*. If it is not a crime to be a woman, why are women subjected to unequal payment with men for the same service? Why are they forced at times to don men's clothes in order to obtain employment that will keep them from starvation?

Miss COUZINS said that the American-born woman was "a woman without a country"; but before she had closed she had proved that this country belonged exclusively to the women. It was a woman, Queen Isabella, that enabled a man to discover this country, and in the old flag the initials were "I" and "F," representing Isabella and Ferdinand, showing that it was acknowledged that the woman's initial was the more important in this matter and to be first considered. It was a woman, Mary Chilton, that first landed on Plymouth rock. It was a woman, Betsy Ross, that designed our beautiful flag, the original eagle on our silver dollar, and the seal of the United States without which no money is legal. All the way down in our national history woman has been hand in hand with man, has assisted, supported and encouraged him, and now there are women ready to help reform the life of the body politic, and side by side with man work to purify, refine and ennoble the world. Miss Couzins seemed Inspired by her own thoughts and carried the audience along with her in her flights of eloquence.

Being asked to make a few closing remarks, Mrs. May Wright Sewall said:

Difficult, indeed, is the task of closing a three days' convention; vain is the hope to do it with fitting words which shall not be mere repetitions of what has been said on this platform. The truth which bases this claim lies in a nut-shell, and the shell seems hard to be cracked. It is unfair, when comparing the ability of men and women, to compare the average woman to the exceptional man, but this is what man always does. If, perchance, he admits not only the equality but the superiority of woman, he tells her she must not vote because she is so nearly an angel, so much better than he is, and this, in the face of the fact that every angel represented or revealed has been shown in the form of a *handsome young man*. If any class then must abstain from meddling in politics on account of relation to the angels, it is the men! But she informed the gentlemen she had no fears for them on that ground, for their relationship was not *near* enough to cause any serious inconvenience. Speaking of the objections to women undertaking grave or deep studies, that woman lacks the logical faculty, that she has only intuition, nerve-force, etc., Mrs. Sewall said: It is true of every woman who has done the worthiest work in science, literature, or reform, from Diotima, the teacher of Socrates, to Margaret Fuller, the pupil of Channing and the peer of Emerson, that ignoring the methods of nerves and instincts, she has placed herself squarely on the basis of observation, investigation and reason. Men will admit that these women had strength and logic, but say they are exceptional women. So are Gladstone, Bismarck, Gambetta, Lincoln and Garfield exceptional men. She mentioned Miss Anthony's proposed trip to Europe, and said that she had not had a holiday for thirty years.

Miss ANTHONY said she wished to call attention to the report of the Special Committee of the Senate, which distinctly stated that the question had had "general agitation," and that the petitions at different times presented were both "*numerous* and respectable." This was sufficient answer, coming from such high authority, that of Senator Anthony, to all the insinuations and unjust remarks about the petitions presented to congress, and with regard to the assertion that women themselves did not want the ballot. She expressed her obligations to the press, and mentioned that the *Sunday Chronicle* had announced its intention of giving much valuable space to the proceedings, and that when she had learned this, she had ordered 1,000 copies, which she would send to the address of any friend in the audience free of charge.

The "Star Spangled Banner" was then sung, Miss Couzins and Mrs. Shattuck singing the solos, Mr. Wilson of the Foundry M. E. Church, leading the audience in the chorus, the whole producing a fine effect. Miss Anthony said the audience could see how much better it was to have a man to help, even in singing. This brought down the house.

In closing this report, a word may be said of the persons most conspicuous in it. This year several remarkable additions have been made to our number, and it is of these especially that we would speak. Mrs. Minor of St. Louis, in her manner has all the gentleness and sweetness of the high-born Southern lady; her personal appearance is very pleasant, her hair a light chestnut, untouched with gray; her face has lost the color of youth, but her eyes have still their fire, toned down by the sorrow they have seen. Madame Neyman is also new to the Washington platform. She is a piquant little German lady, with vivacious manner, most agreeable accent, and looked in her closely-fitting black-velvet dress as if she might have just stepped out of a painting. In direct contrast is Mrs. Miller of Maryland—a large, dark-haired matron, past middle age, but newly born in her enthusiasm for the cause. She is a worker as well as a talker, and is a decided acquisition to the ranks. The other novice in the work is Mrs. Amy Dunn, who has taken such a novel way to render assistance. Mrs. Dunn is tall and slender, with dark hair and eyes. She is a shrewd observer, does not talk much socially, but when she says anything it is to the point. Her character sketch, "Zekle's Wife," will be a stepping-stone to many a woman on her way to the suffrage platform.

Two women who have done and are doing a great work in this city, and who are not among the public speakers, are Mrs. Spofford, the treasurer, wife of the proprietor of the Riggs House, and Miss Ellen H. Sheldon, secretary of the Association. To these ladies is due much of the success of the convention. Mrs. Sheldon is of diminutive stature, with gray hair, and Mrs. Spofford is of large and queenly figure, with white hair. Her magnificent presence is always remarked at the meetings.

The following were among the letters read at this convention:

10 DUCHESS STREET, PORTLAND PLACE, LONDON, Eng., Jan. 12.

DEAR MISS ANTHONY: To you and our friends in convention assembled, I send greeting from the old world. It needs but little imagination to bring Lincoln Hall, the usual fine audiences, and the well-known faces on the platform, before my mind, so familiar have fifteen years of these conventions in Washington made such scenes to me. How many times, as I have sat in your midst and listened to the grand speeches of my noble coädjutors, I have wondered how much longer we should be called upon to rehearse the oft-repeated arguments in favor of equal rights to all. Surely the grand declarations of statesmen at every period in our history should make the principle of equality so self-evident as to end at once all class legislation.

It is now over half a century since Frances Wright with eloquent words first asserted the political rights of women in our republic; and from that day to this, inspired apostles in an unbroken line of succession have proclaimed the new gospel of the motherhood of God and of humanity. We have plead our case in conventions of the people, in halls of legislation, before committees ot congress, and in the Supreme Court of the United States, and our arguments still remain unanswered. History shows no record of a fact like this, where so large a class of virtuous, educated, native-born citizens have been subjugated by the national government to foreign domination.

Digitized by Google

While our American statesmen scorn the thought that even the most gifted son of a monarch, an emperor or a czar should ever occupy the proud position of a president of these United States, and by constitutional provision deny to all foreigners this high privilege, they yet allow the very riff-raff of the old world to make laws for the proudest women of the republic, to make the moral code for the daughters of our people, to sit in judgment on all our domestic relations.

England has taken two grand steps within the last year in extending the municipal suffrage to the woman of Scotland and in passing the Married Woman's Property bill. They are holding meetings all over the country now in favor of parliamentary suffrage. Statistics show that women generally *exercise* the rights already accorded. They have recently passed through a very heated election for members of the school-board in various localities. Miss Lydia Becker was elected in Manchester, and Miss Eva Müller in one of the districts of London, and several other women in different cities.

A little incident will show you how naturally the political equality of woman is coming about in Queen Victoria's dominions. I was invited to dine at Barn Elms, a beautiful estate on the banks of the Thames, a spot full of classic associations, the residence of Mr. Charles McLaren, a member of parliament. Opposite me at dinner sat a bright young girl tastefully attired; on my right the gentleman to whom she was engaged; at the head of the table a sparkling matron of twenty-five, one of the most popular speakers here on the woman suffrage platform. The dinner-table talk was such as might be heard in any cultivated circle—art, literature, amusements, passing events, etc., etc.—and when the repast was finished, ladies and gentlemen, in full dinner dress, went off to attend an important school-board meeting, our host to preside and the young lady opposite me to make the speech of the evening, and all done in as matter-of-fact a way as if the party were going to the opera. Members of parliament and lord-mayors preside and speak at all their public meetings and help in every way to carry on the movement, giving money most liberally; and yet how seldom any of our senators or congressmen will even speak at our meetings, to say nothing of sending us a check of fifty or a hundred dollars. I trust that we shall accomplish enough this year to place the women of republican America at least on an even platform with monarchical England. With sincere wishes for the success of the convention, cordially yours,

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

LONDON, January 10, 1883.

DEAR MISS ANTHONY: I was very glad indeed to receive notice of your mid-winter conference in time to send you a few words about the progress of our work in England. I believe our disappointment at the result of the vote in Nebraska must have been greater than yours, as, being on the spot, you saw the difficulties to be surmounted. I had so hoped that the men of a free new State would prove themselves juster and wiser than the men of our older civilizations, whose prejudice and precedents are such formidable barriers. But we cannot, judging from a distance, look upon the work of the campaign as thrown away. Twenty-five thousand votes in favor of woman suffrage in the face of such enormous odds is really a victory, and the legislatures of these States are deeply pledged to ratify the constitutional amendment, if passed by congress. We look forward hopefully to the discussion in congress. The majority report of the Senate cannot fail to secure attention, and I hope your present convention will bring together national forces that will greatly influence the debate.

CAROLINE A. BIGGS.

51 RUE DE VARENNE, PARIS, January 15, 1883.

MY DEAR MISS ANTHONY: Perhaps a brief account of what has been done with the two packages of "The History of Woman Suffrage" which you sent me for distribution in Europe may prove interesting to the convention. In the first place, sets in sheep have been deposited already, or will have been before spring, in all the great continental libraries from Russia to France, and from Denmark to Turkey. In the second place, copies in cloth have been presented to reformers, publicists, editors, etc,

in every country of the old world. This generous distribution of a costly work has already begun to produce an effect. Besides a large number of private letters from all parts of Europe acknowledging the receipt of the volumes and bestowing on their contents the highest praise, the History has been reviewed in numerous reform, educational and socialistic periodicals and newspapers in almost every modern European tongue. Nor is this all. Every week a new pamphlet or book is sent me, or comes under my notice, in which this History is cited, sometimes at great length, and is pronounced to be the authority on the American women's movement. I have carefully kept all these letters, newspaper notices, etc., and at the proper time I hope to prepare a little pamphlet for your publisher on European opinion concerning your great work.

Very truly yours, THEODORE STANTON.

51 RUE DE VARENNE, PARIS, January 15, 1883.

DEAR MISS ANTHONY: My husband has just read me a letter he has written you concerning the enthusiastic reception your big History has had among liberal people on this side of the Atlantic, but he did not inform you that he should send the American public next spring a similar though much smaller work, entitled "The Woman Question in Europe." The Putnams of New York are now busy on the volume. You in the new world have little idea how the leaders of the women's movement here watch everything you do in the United States. The great fact which my husband's volume will teach you in America is the important and direct influence your movement is having on the younger, less developed, but growing revolution in favor of our sex, now in progress in every country of the old world. While assisting in the preparation of the manuscript for this book this fact has been thrust upon my notice at every instant, and never before did I fully realize the grand rôle the United States is acting in this nineteenth century, for, rest assured, the moment European women are emancipated monarchy gives way to the republic everywhere.

Most sincerely yours, MARGUERITTE BERRY STANTON.

134 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, S. E., January 25, 1883.

DEAR SUSAN ANTHONY: I believe that this is the only week of the whole winter when I could not come to you nor attend your convention, much as I wish to do so. It has been an exceptional week to me in the way of work and engagements, full of both as I always am. I could not call on you last Monday, as I was in my own crowded parlors from 1 till 10 o'clock at night. I tell you this that you may know that I did not of my own accord stay away from you. I have not had a moment to write you a coherent letter, such as I would be willing you should read. But I *have* saved the best reports of the convention, and it shall have a good notice in the *Independent* of week after next. It shall have only praise. Of course I could write a brighter, more characteristic notice could I myself have attended. Should you stay over next Sunday I can see you yet; but if not, remember I think of you always with the warmest interest, and meet you always with unchanged affection.

Ever your friend, MARY CLEMMER.

May God bless and keep you, I ever pray.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THURSDAY, March 1, 1883.

Mr. WHITE, by unanimous consent, from the Special Committee on Woman Suffrage, reported back the joint resolution (H. Res., 255) proposing an amendment to the constitution, which was referred to the House calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

* This was the last word from this dear friend to one of our number. I met her afterward as Mrs. Hudson with her husband in London. We dined together one evening at the pleasant home of Moncure D. Conway. She was as full as ever of plans for future usefulness and enjoyment. From England she went for a short trip on the continent. In parting I little thought she would so soon finish her work on earth. E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

Mr. SPRINGER: As a member of that committee I have not seen the report, and do not know whether it meets with my concurrence.*

Mr. WHITE: I ask by unanimous consent that the minority may have leave to submit their views, to be printed with the majority report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair hears no objection.

MR. WHITE, from the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage, submitted the following:

The Select Committee on Woman Suffrage, to whom was referred House Resolution No. 255, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to secure the right of suffrage to citizens of the United States without regard to sex, having considered the same, respectfully report:

In attempting to comprehend the vast results that could and would be attained by the adoption of the proposed article to the constitution, a few considerations are presented that are claimed by the friends of woman suffrage to be worthy of the most serious attention, among which are the following:

I. There are vast interests in property vested in women, which property is affected by taxation and legislation, without the owners having voice or representation in regard to it. The adoption of the proposed amendment would remove a manifest injustice.

II. Consider the unjust discriminations made against women in industrial and educational pursuits, and against those who are compelled to earn a livelihood by work of hand or brain. By conferring upon such the right of suffrage, their condition, it is claimed, would be greatly improved by the enlargement of their influence.

III. The questions of social and family relations are of equal importance to and affect as many women as men. Giving to women a voice in the enactment of laws pertaining to divorce and the custody of children and division of property would be merely recognizing an undeniable right.

IV. Municipal regulations in regard to houses of prostitution, of gambling, of retail liquor traffic, and of all other abominations of modern society, might be shaped very differently and more perfectly were women allowed the ballot.

V. If women had a voice in legislation, the momentous question of peace and war, which may act with such fearful intensity upon women, might be settled with less bloodshed.

VI. Finally, there is no condition, status in life, of rich or poor; no question, moral or political; no interest, present or future; no ties, foreign or domestic; no issues, local or national; no phase of human life, in which the mother is not equally interested with the father, the daughter with the son, the sister with the brother. Therefore the one should have equal voice with the other in molding the destiny of this nation.

Believing these considerations to be so important as to challenge the attention of all patriotic citizens, and that the people have a right to be heard in the only authoritative manner recognized by the constitution, we report the accompanying resolution with a favorable recommendation in order that the people, through the legislatures of their respective States, may express their views:

JOINT RESOLUTION *proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:*

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said constitution, namely:

---

* Mr. Springer had never been present at a single meeting of the committee, though always officially notified. Neither did Mr. Muldrow of Mississippi ever honor the committee with his presence. However, Mr Stockslager of Indiana and Mr. Vance of North Carolina were always in their places, and the latter, we thought, almost persuaded to consider with favor the claims of women to political equality.

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

SEC. 2. The congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article.

Thus closed the forty-seventh congress, and although with so little promise of any substantial good for women, yet this slight recognition in legislation was encouraging to those who had so long appealed in vain for the attention of their representatives. A committee to even consider the wrongs of woman was more than had ever been secured before, and one to propose some measures of justice, sustained by the votes of a few statesmen awake to the degradation of disfranchisement, gave some faint hope of more generous action in the near future. The tone of the debates* in these later years even, on the nature and rights of women, is wholly unworthy the present type of developed womanhood and the age in which we live.

* Reports of congressional action and the conventions of 1884–85 have been already published in pamphlet form, and we shall print the reports hereafter once in two years, corresponding with the terms of congress. Our plan is to bind these together once in six years, making volumes of the size of those already published. These pamphlets, as well as the complete History in three volumes, are for sale at the publishing house of Charles Mann, 8 Elm Park, Rochester, N. Y.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXXI.

MASSACHUSETTS.

BY HARRIET H. ROBINSON.

The Woman's Hour—Lydia Maria Child Petitions Congress—First New England Convention—The New England, American and Massachusetts Associations—*Woman's Journal*—Bishop Gilbert Haven—The Centennial Tea-party—County Societies—Concord Convention—Thirtieth Anniversary of the Worcester Convention—School Suffrage Association—Legislative Hearing—First Petitions—The Remonstrants Appear—Women in Politics—Campaign of 1872—Great Meeting in Tremont Temple—Women at the Polls—Provisions of Former State Constitutions—Petitions, 1853—School-Committee Suffrage, 1879—Women Threatened with Arrest—Changes in the Laws—Woman Now Owns her own Clothing—Harvard Annex—Woman in the Professions—Samuel E. Sewall and William I. Bowditch—Supreme-Court Decisions—Sarah E. Wall—Francis Jackson—Julia Ward Howe—Mary E. Stevens—Lucia M. Peabody—Lelia Josephine Robinson—Eliza (Jackson) Eddy's Will.

FROM 1860 to 1866 there is no record to be found of any public meeting on the subject of woman's rights, in Massachusetts.* During these years the war of the rebellion had been fought. Pending the great struggle the majority of the leaders, who were also anti-slavery, had thought it to be the wiser policy for the women to give way for a time, in order that all the working energy might be given to the slave. "It is not the woman's but the negro's hour"; "After the slave—then the woman," said Wendell Phillips in his stirring speeches, at this date. "Keep quiet, work for us," said other of the anti-slavery leaders to the women. "Wait! help us to abolish slavery, and then we will work for you." And the women, who had the welfare of the country as much at heart as the men, kept quiet; worked in hospital and field; sacrificed sons and husbands; did what is always woman's part in wars between man and man—and waited. If anything can make the women of the State regret that they were silent as to their own claims for six eventful years that the freedom of the black man might be secured, it is the fact that

* For details of early history see vol. I., chap. viii. See also "Massachusetts in the Woman Suffrage Movement," Roberts Bros., Boston.

now in 1885 his vote is ever adverse to women's enfranchisement. When the fourteenth amendment to the United States Constitution was proposed, in which the negro's liberty and his right to the ballot were to be established, an effort was made to secure in it some recognition of the rights of woman. Massachusetts sent a petition, headed with the name of Lydia Maria Child, against the introduction of the word "male" in the proposed amendment. When this petition was offered to the greatest of America's emancipation leaders, for presentation to congress, he received and presented it under protest. He thought the woman question should not be forced at such a time, and the only answer from congress this "woman-intruding" petition received was found in the fourteenth amendment itself, in which the word "male," with unnecessary iteration, was repeated, so that there might be no mistake in future concerning woman's rights, under the Constitution of the United States.*

The war was over. The rights of the black man, for whom the women had worked and waited, were secured, but under the new amendment, by which his race had been made free, the white women of the United States were more securely held in political slavery. It was time, indeed, to hold conventions and agitate anew the question of woman's rights. The lesson of the war had been well learned. Women had been taught to understand politics, the "science of government," and to take an interest in public events; and some who before the war had not thought upon the matter, began to ask themselves why thousands of ignorant *men* should be made voters and they, or their sex, still kept in bondage under the law.

In 1866, May 31, the first meeting of the American Equal Rights Association was held at the Meionaon in Boston.† In 1868 the call for a New England convention was issued and the meeting was held November 18, 19, at Horticultural Hall, Boston. James Freeman Clarke presided. In this convention sat many of the distinguished men and women of the New England States.‡

* As an original question, no friend of woman suffrage can deny that it was a mean thing to put the word "male" into the fourteenth amendment. It was, doubtless, wise to adopt that amendment. It was an extension of the right of suffrage, and so far in the line of American progress, yet it was also an implied denial of the suffrage to women.—[Warrington in the *Springfield Republican*.

† See Vol. II., page 178.

‡ John Neal came from Maine; Nathaniel and Armenia White from New Hampshire; Isabella Hooker from Connecticut; Thomas W. Higginson from Rhode Island; and John G. Whittier, Samuel May, jr., Gilbert Haven, John T. Sargent, Frank W. Bird, Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison, William S. Robinson, Stephen and Abby Kelley Foster, with a host of others, from Massachusetts. Lucy Stone and Henry B. Blackwell, who then lived in New Jersey, were also among the speakers.

Digitized by Google

old-time advocates, together with newer converts to the doctrine, who then became identified with the cause of equal rights irrespective of sex. This convention was called by the Rev. Olympia Brown.* The hall was crowded with eager listeners anxious to hear what would be said on a subject thought to be ridiculous by a large majority of people in the community. Some of the teachers of Boston sent a letter to the convention, signed with their names, expressing their interest as women. Henry Wilson avowed his belief in the equal rights of woman, but thought the time had not yet come for such a consummation, and said that, for this reason, he had voted against the question in the United States Senate; "though," he continued, "I was afterwards ashamed of having so voted." Like another celebrated Massachusetts politician, he believed in the principle of the thing, but was "agin its enforcement." At this date the popular interest heretofore given to the anti-slavery question was transferred to the woman suffrage movement.

The New England Woman Suffrage Association was formed at this convention. Julia Ward Howe was elected its president, and made her first address on the subject of woman's equality with man. On its executive board were many representative names from the six New England States.† By the formation of this society, a great impetus was given to the suffrage cause in New England. It held conventions and mass-meetings, printed tracts

* In giving an account of her efforts in this direction she says: "After my return from Kansas in 1867, I felt that we ought to do something for the cause in Massachusetts. There was at that time no organization in the State, and there had been no revival of the subject in the minds of the people since the war, which had swallowed up every other interest. In the spring of 1868, I wrote to Abby Kelley Foster, telling her my wish to have something done in our own State, and she advised me to call together a few persons known to be in favor of suffrage, some day during anniversary week, in some parlor in Boston. I corresponded with Adin Ballou, E. D. Draper, and others, on the subject, and talked the matter over with Prof. T. T. Leonard, teacher of elocution, who offered his hall for a place of meeting. I wrote a notice inviting all persons interested in woman suffrage to come to Mr. Leonard's hall, on a certain day and hour. At the time appointed the hall was full of people. I opened the meeting, and stated why I had called it; others took up the theme, and we had a lively meeting. All agreed that something should be done, and a committee of seven was appointed to call a convention for the purpose of organizing a woman suffrage association. Caroline M. Severance, Stephen S. Foster, Sarah Southwick and myself, were of this committee. We held a number of meetings and finally decided to call a convention early in the autumn of 1868. This convention was held in Horticultural Hall, and the result was the organization of the New England Woman Suffrage Association."

† *President*, Julia Ward Howe; *Vice-presidents*, William Lloyd Garrison, Boston; Paulina W. Davis, Providence, R. I.; James Freeman Clarke, Boston; Sarah Shaw Russell, Boston; Neil Dow, Me.; Lucy Goddard, Boston; Samuel E. Sewall, Melrose; Lidian Emerson, Concord; John Hooker, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Hartford, Ct.; Harriot K. Hunt, Boston; James Hutchinson, jr., West Randolph, Vt.; Armenia S. White, Concord, N. H.; Louisa M. Alcott, Concord; L. Maria Child, Wayland; John Weiss, Watertown. *Corresponding Secretary*, Sara Clark, Boston. *Recording Secretary*, Charles K. Whipple, Boston. *Treasurer*, E. D. Draper, Boston. *Executive Committee:* Lucy Stone, Newark, N. J.; T. W. Higginson, Newport, R. I.; Caroline M. Severance, West Newton; Francis W. Bird, East Walpole; Mary E. Sargent, Boston; Nathaniel White, Concord, N. H.; Richard P. Hallowell, Boston; Stephen S. Foster, Worcester; Sarah H. Southwick, Grantville; Rowland Connor, Boston; B. F. Bowles, Cambridge; George H. Vibbert, Rockport; Olympia Brown, Weymouth; Samuel May, jr., Leicester; Nina Moore, Hyde Park.

and documents, and put lecturers in the field. It set in motion two woman suffrage bazars, and organized subscription festivals, and other enterprises to raise money to carry on the work. It projected the American, and Massachusetts suffrage associations; it urged the formation of local and county suffrage societies, and set up the *Woman's Journal.* The New England Association held its first anniversary in May, 1869, and the meeting was even more successful than the opening one of the preceding year. On this occasion Mrs. Livermore spoke in Boston for the first time, and many new friends coming forward gave vigor and freshness to the movement.* Wendell Philips, Lucy Stone and Gilbert Haven, spoke at this convention. It was on this occasion that the "good Bishop," as he afterward came to be called, was met on leaving the meeting by one who did not know his opinion on the subject. This person expressed surprise on seeing him at a woman's rights meeting, and said; "*What! you* here?" "Yes," said he, "I *am* here! I *believe* in this reform. I am going to start in the beginning, and ride with the procession." After this, not until his earthly journey was finished, was his place in "the procession" found vacant. Since 1869 the New England Association has held its annual meeting in Boston during anniversary week, in May, when reports from various States are offered, concerning suffrage work done during the year. The American Woman Suffrage Association was organized in 1869. Since its formation it has held its annual conventions in some of the chief cities of the several States.† A meeting was held in Horticultural Hall, Boston, January 28, 1870, to organize the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association.‡

---

* Ednah D. Cheney, Rev. C. A. Bartol, Rev. F. E. Abbot, Rev. Phœbe Hanaford and Hon. George F. Hoar.

† For report of American Association see Vol. II., page 756.

‡ Lucy Stone, Mary A. Livermore, Stephen S. and Abby Kelley Foster, H. B. Blackwell, Rev. W. H. Channing, Rev. J. F. Clarke, Rev. Gilbert Haven, Julia Ward Howe and Elizabeth K. Churchill made eloquent speeches.

The first board of officers of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association was: *President*, Julia Ward Howe. *Vice-presidents:* William Lloyd Garrison, Roxbury; Anne B. Earle, Worcester; John G. Whittier, Amesbury; Lidian Emerson, Concord; Hon. Robert C. Pitman, New Bedford; Mrs. Richmond Kingman, Cummington; Rev. R. B. Stratton, Worcester; Edna D. Cheney, Jamaica Plain; Hon. Isaac Ames, Haverhill; Sarah Shaw Ames, Boston; J. Ingersoll Bowditch, West Roxbury; Lydia Maria Child, Wayland; Mary Dewey, Sheffield; Hon. George F. Hoar, Worcester; Sarah Grimke, Hyde Park; Sarah R. Hathaway, Boston; William I. Bowditch, Boston; Harriot K. Hunt, M. D., Boston; Hon. Samuel E. Sewall, Melrose; A. Bronson Alcott, Concord; Angelina G. Weld, Hyde Park; Hon. Henry Wilson, Natick; Rev. James Freeman Clarke, Boston; Charlotte A. Joy, Mendon; Jacob M. Manning, D. D., Lucy Sewall, M. D., Boston; Rev. Joseph May, Newburyport; Maria Zakrzewska, M. D., Roxbury; Rev. William B. Wright, Boston; Rev. Jesse H. Jones, Natick; Phœbe A. Hanaford, Reading; Seth Hunt, Northampton: Maria S. Porter, Melrose. *Executive Committee:* Rev. Rowland Connor, Boston; Caroline M. Severance, West Newton; Rev. W. H. H. Murray, Boston; Gordon M. Fiske, Palmer; Sarah A. Vibbert, Rockport; Rev. Gilbert Haven, Malden; Caroline Remond

Digitized by Google

The Massachusetts Association is the most active of the three societies named. Its work is generally local though it has sent help to Colorado, Michigan, and other Western States. It has kept petitions in circulation, and has presented petitions and memorials to the State legislatures. It has asked for hearings and secured able speakers for them. It has held conventions, mass-meetings, Fourth of July celebrations. It has helped organize local Woman suffrage clubs and societies, and has printed for circulation numerous woman suffrage tracts. The amount of work done by its lecturing agents can be seen by the statement of Margaret W. Campbell, who alone, as agent of the American, the New England and the Massachusetts associations, traveled in twenty different States and two territories, organizing and speaking in conventions.* As part of the latest work of this society may be mentioned its efforts to present before the women of the State, in clear and comprehensive form, an explanation of the different sections of the new law "allowing women to vote for school committees." As soon as the law passed the legislature of 1879, a circular of instructions to women was carefully prepared by Samuel E. Sewall, an eminent lawyer and member of the board of the Massachusetts Association, in which all the points of law in relation to the new right were ably presented. Thousands of copies of this circular were sent to women all over the State.

The Centennial Tea Party was held in Boston, December 15, 1873, in response to the following call:

The women of New England who believe that "taxation without representation is tyranny," and that our forefathers were justified in defying despotic power by throwing the tea into Boston harbor, invite the men and women of New England to unite with them in celebrating the one-hundredth anniversary of that event in Fanueil Hall.†

Putman, Salem; Frank B. Sanborn, Springfield; Mercy B. Jackson, M. D., Boston; Samuel May, jr., Leicester; Margaret W. Campbell, Springfield; Rev. C. M. Wines, Brookline; Mary A. Livermore, Melrose; William S. Robinson, Malden; Henry B. Blackwell, Boston; Lucy Stone, Boston; S. S. Foster, Worcester; Mrs. Wilcox, Worcester; Ada R. Bowles, Cambridge. *Corresponding Secretary*, Nina Moore, Hyde Park. *Recording Secretary*, Charles C. Whipple, Boston. *Treasurer*, E. D. Draper, Hopedale.

* Mary F. Eastman, Ada C. Bowles, Lorenza Haynes, Elizabeth K. Churchill, Hulda B. Loud, Matilda Hindman and other agents in the lecture field have also done a great deal of missionary work.

† The committee of arrangements were Mrs. Isaac Ames, Harriet H. Robinson, Sarah B. Otis, Philip Wheeler, Jane Tenney, Mrs. A. A. Fellows, Mrs. Jackson, Miss Talbot and Miss Halsey.

The speakers were: Wendell Phillips, Mary A. Livermore, Frederick Douglass, William Lloyd Garrison, Elizabeth K. Churchill, Margaret W. Campbell, Mary F. Eastman, Henry B. Blackwell, Lucy Stone and others. Julia Ward Howe and Mr. C. P. Cranch, read original poems. Two old-time tea-party songs, curiosities in their line, were read. One, dated Boston, 1773, entitled "Lines on Bohea Tea," was written by Susannah Clarke, great-aunt of W. S. Robinson; the other, copied from Thomas' *Boston Journal*, of December 2, 1773, was written by Mrs. Ames, a tailoress.

Digitized by Google

Three thousand people were in attendance, and it was altogether an enthusiastic occasion and one long to be remembered.

The record of conventions and meetings held by the Massachusetts Association by no means includes all such gatherings held in different towns and cities of the State. The county and local societies have done a vast amount of work. The Hampden society was started in 1868, with Eliphalet Trask, Frank B. Sanborn and Margaret W. Campbell as leading officers. This was the first county society formed in the State. Julia Ward Howe, a fresh convert of the recent convention went to Salem to lecture on woman suffrage, and the Essex county society was formed with Mrs. Sarah G. Wilkins and Mrs. Delight R. P. Hewitt—the only two Salem women who went to the 1850 convention at Worcester—on its executive board. The Middlesex county society followed, planned by Ada C. Bowles and officered by names well known in that historic old county. The Hampshire and Worcester societies brought up the rear; the former planned by Seth Hunt of Northampton. Notable conventions were held by the Middlesex society in 1876—one in Malden, one in Melrose and one in Concord, organized and conducted by its president, Harriet H. Robinson. This last celebrated town had never before been so favored. These meetings were conducted something after the style of local church conferences. They were well advertised, and many people came. A collation was provided by the ladies of each town, and the feast of reason was so judiciously mingled with the triumphs of cookery, that converts to the cause were never so easily won. Many women present said to the president: "I never before heard a woman's rights speech. If these are the reasons why women should vote, I believe in voting."

The Concord convention was held about a month after the great centennial celebration of April 19, 1875—a celebration in which no woman belonging to that town took any official part. Nor was there any place of honor found for the more distinguished women who had come long distances to share in the festivities. Some of the women were descendents of Governor John Hancock, Dr. Samuel Prescott, Major John Buttrick, Rev. William Emerson and Lieutenant Emerson Cogswell. Though no seat of honor in the big tent in which the speeches were made was given to the women of to-day, silent memorials of those who had taken part in the events of one hundred years ago, had found

Digitized by Google

a conspicuous place there—the scissors that cut the immortal cartridges made by the women on that eventful day, and the ancient flag that the fingers of some of the mothers of the Revolution had made. Though the Concord women were not permitted to share the centennial honors, they were not deprived of the privilege of paying their part of the expenses incident to the occasion. To meet these, an increased tax-rate was assessed upon all the property owners in the town; and, since one-fifth of the town tax of Concord is paid by women, it will be seen what was their share in the great centennial celebration of 1876.

The knowledge of the proceedings at Concord added new zest to the spirit of the three conventions, and the events of the day were used by the speakers to point the moral of the woman's rights question. Lucy Stone made one of her most effective and eloquent speeches upon this subject. She said:

FELLOW CITIZENS (I had almost said fellow subjects): What we need is that women should feel their mean position; when that happens, they will soon make an effort to get out of it. Everything is possible to him that wills. All that is needed for the success of the cause of woman suffrage is to have women know that they want to vote. Concord and Lexington got into a fight about the centennial, and Concord voted $10,000 for the celebration in order to eclipse Lexington. One-fifth of the tax of Concord is paid by the women, yet not one of these women dared to go to the town hall and cast her vote upon that subject. This is exactly the same thing which took place one hundred years ago—taxation without representation, against which the *men* of Concord then rebelled. If I were an inhabitant of Concord, I would let my house be sold over my head and my clothes off my back and be hanged by the neck before I would pay a cent of it! Men of Melrose, Concord and Malden, why persecute us? Would you like to be a slave? Would you like to be disfranchised? Would you like to be bound to respect the laws which you cannot make? There are 15,000,000 of women whom the government denies legal rights.

It might be supposed that a spot upon which the battle for freedom and independence was first begun would always be the vantage ground of questions relating to personal liberty. But such is not the fact. Concord was never an anti-slavery town, though some of its best citizens took active part in all the abolition movements. When the time came that women were allowed to vote for school committees, the same intolerant spirit which ignored and shut them out of the centennial celebration was again manifested toward them—not only by the leading magnates, but also by the petty officials of the town. Some of them have from

Digitized by Google

the first shown a great deal of ingenuity in inventing ways to intimidate and mislead the women voters.

At the annual convention of the Massachusetts Association, in May, 1880, the following resolution was passed:

WHEREAS, We believe in keeping the land-marks and traditions of our movement; and

WHEREAS, It will be thirty years next October since the first woman's rights meeting was held in the State, and it seems fitting that there should be some celebration of the event; therefore,

Resolved, That we will hold a woman suffrage jubilee in Worcester, October 23 and 24 next, to commemorate the anniversary of our first convention.

A committee* of arrangements was chosen, and the meeting was held. There were present many whose silver hairs told of long and faithful service. The oldest ladies there were Mrs. Lydia Brown of Lynn, Mrs. Wilbour of Worcester, and Julia E. Smith Parker of Glastonbury, Conn. On the afternoon of the first day there was an informal gathering of friends in the anteroom of Horticultural Hall. Old-time memories were recalled by those who had not seen each other for many years, and the common salutation was: "How gray you've grown!" Many of them had indeed grown gray in the service, and their faces were changed, but made beautiful by a life devoted to a noble purpose. There were many present who had attended the convention of thirty years ago—Abby Kelley Foster, Lucy Stone, Antoinette Brown Blackwell, Paulina Gerry, Rev. Samuel May, Rev. W. H. Channing, Joseph A. Howland, Adeline H. Howland, Dr. Martha H. Mowry and many, many others. It was very pleasant indeed to hear these veterans whose clear voices have spoken out so long and so bravely for the cause. The speaking† at all the sessions was excellent, and the spirit of the convention was very reverent and hopeful.

The tone of the press concerning woman's rights meetings had changed greatly since thirty years before. "Hen conventions" had gone by, and a woman's meeting was now called by its proper

---

* *Committee of Arrangements*—Lucy Stone, Abby Kelley Foster, Thomas J. Lothrop, Timothy K. Earle, Sarah E. Wall, Harriet H. Robinson and E. H. Church. At this public gathering, Athol, Boston, Haverhill, Leicester, Leominster, Lowell, Malden, Melrose, Milford, North Brookfield, Taunton, and many other Massachusetts towns were well represented.

† The speakers were Lucy Stone, Rev. W. H. Channing, Mary A. Livermore, Mary F. Eastman, Kate N. Doggett, Rev. F. A. Hinckley, Ednah D. Cheney, T. Wentworth Higginson, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Anna Garlin Spencer and Julia E. Parker. Harriet H. Robinson read a condensed history of Massachusetts in the woman suffrage movement. Interesting letters were received from Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, F. W. Bird, H. B. Blackwell, Margaret W. Campbell, Mrs. C. I. H. Nichols and Frances D. Gage. Two original woman suffrage songs, written by Anna Q. T. Parsons and Caroline A. Mason, were sung on the occasion.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1934 L

Digitized by Google

Harriet H. Robinson

Digitized by Google

[illegible]

[illegible] Massachusetts School [illegible] Association [illegible] and city committees [illegible] a larger [illegible] previous years. In [illegible] the whole State was 4,5[illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible] was 1,100. This year (1883) a movement among [illegible] Catholic women [illegible] raised the number who [illegible] and it is estimated that when the tax- [illegible] are added, the whole number will be about [illegible] National Woman Suffrage Association of Massachusetts [illegible] at January 1882, of members [illegible] had joined [illegible] at its thirteenth annual [illegible] Boston, May 26, 27, 188[illegible] [illegible] of its constitution, its object is to [illegible] to the ballot, by working for nat[illegible] [illegible] or any other form of suffrage which [illegible] the [illegible] most expedient. While it is auxiliary to the Na- [illegible] Association, it reserves to itself the [illegible] independent [illegible] It has held conventions ‡ in Boston and some of the [illegible] of the State, sent delegates to the annual Washington

[illegible] *President*, Miss Abby W. May; *Vice-president*, Mrs. Edna [illegible] Mrs. L. M. Peabody, [illegible] A. E. Fisher, Mrs. [illegible] Mrs. [illegible] A. [illegible] Mrs. M. H. [illegible] Mrs. Fifield, Mrs. [illegible] Clarke, Mrs. [illegible] *Committee*, Miss Lucia M. Peabody, Mrs. Fifield and Mrs. [illegible]

[illegible] Dr. [illegible] Merritt, Jean D. Foster, Emma L. Clarry, Louisa E. [illegible], Esther P. [illegible] Lydia A. Hatch; *secretaries*, Hannah M. [illegible], Elizabeth B. [illegible] [illegible] Lydia [illegible]

[illegible] South Boston, [illegible] Uxbridge, Millbury, Bed- [illegible] Lowell, Rowley, [illegible] Malden, Cambridge, Beverly

Digitized by Google

Harriet H. Robinson

Digitized by Google

name. Representatives of leading newspapers from all parts of the State were present, and the reports were written in a just and friendly spirit.

The Massachusetts School Suffrage Association was formed in 1880, Abby W. May, president.* Its efforts are mostly confined to Boston. An independent movement of women voters in Boston, distinct from all organizations, was formed in 1884, and subdivided into ward and city committees. These did much valuable work and secured a larger number of voters than had qualified in previous years. In 1880 the number of registered women in the whole State was 4,566, and in Boston 826. In 1884, chiefly owing to the ward and city committees, the number in Boston alone was 1,100. This year (1885) a movement among the Roman Catholic women has raised the number who are assessed to vote to 1,843; and it is estimated that when the tax-paying women are added, the whole number will be about 2,500.

The National Woman Suffrage Association † of Massachusetts was formed in January, 1882, of members who had joined the National Association at its thirteenth annual meeting, held in Tremont Temple, Boston, May 26, 27, 1881. According to Article II. of its constitution, its object is to secure to women their right to the ballot, by working for national, State, municipal, school, or any other form of suffrage which shall at the time seem most expedient. While it is auxiliary to the National Association, it reserves to itself the right of independent action. It has held conventions ‡ in Boston and some of the chief cities of the State, sent delegates to the annual Washington

* Board of officers for 1885: *President*, Miss Abby W. May; *Vice-president*, Mrs. Edna Dean Cheney; *Secretary*, Miss Brigham; *Treasurer*, Miss S. F. King; *Assistant-secretary*, Miss Von Arnim; *Directors*, Miss H. Lemist, Mrs. J. W. Smith, Mrs. M. P. Lowe, Mrs. H. G. Jackson, Mrs. L. H. Merrick, Mrs. G. L. Ruffin, Mrs. Walton, Mrs. Whitman, Miss Rogers, Miss E. Foster, Miss Shaw, Miss Lougee, Miss L. M. Peabody, Dr. A. E. Fisher, Mrs. Buchanan, Mrs. O. A. Cheney, Mrs. E. Hilt, Mrs. M. W. Nash, Mrs. M. H. Bray, Mrs. Fifield, Mrs. J. F. Clarke, Miss L. P. Hale, Mrs. A. H. Spalding; *Lecture Committee*, Miss Lucia M. Peabody, Mrs. Fifield and Mrs. L. H. King.

† It is the only organization in the State whose business is managed by its members. Its officers are a president, one or more vice-presidents for each county, a secretary, treasurer, auditor, and a standing committee of seven with power to add to its number. These officers are elected annually. Executive meetings, in which all members participate, are held monthly. *President*, Harriette R. Shattuck: *Vice-presidents*, Dr. Salome Merritt, Joan D. Foster, Emma F. Clarry, Louisa E. Brooks, Esther P. Hutchinson, Sarah S. Eddy, Harriet M. Spaulding, Martha E. S. Curtis, Dr. Sarah E. Sherman, Sarah G. Todd, Abbie M. Meserve, Sophia A. Forbes, Esther B. Smith, Emma A. Todd. *Treasurer*, Sara A. Underwood: *Auditor*, Lavina A. Hatch: *Secretaries*, Hannah M. Todd, Elizabeth B. Atwell, Harriet H. Robinson; *Standing Committee*, H. R. Shattuck, Dr. S. Merritt, H. H. Robinson, Lydia E. Hutchings, Mary R. Brown, E. B. Attwill, Lucretia H. Jones.

‡ South Framingham, South Boston. Winchester, Rockland, Wakefield, Uxbridge, Millbury, Bedford, Westboro', Salem, Lynn, Lowell, Rowley, Concord, Woburn, Malden, Cambridge, Beverly Farms.

Digitized by Google

Convention* and published valuable leaflets.† It has rolled up petitions to the State legislature and to congress. Its most valuable work has been the canvass made in certain localities in the city and country in 1884, to ascertain the number of women in favor of suffrage, the number opposed and the number indifferent. The total result showed that there were 405 in favor, 44 opposed, 166 indifferent, 160 refusing to sign, 39 not seen; that is, over nine who would sign themselves in favor to one who would sign herself opposed. This canvass was made by women who gave their time and labor to this arduous work, and the results were duly presented to the legislature.

In 1883 this Association petitioned the legislature to pass a resolution recommending congress to submit a proposition for a sixteenth amendment to the national constitution. The Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage granted a hearing March 23, and soon after presented a favorable report; but the resolution, when brought to a vote, was lost by 21 to 11. This was the first time that the National doctrine of congressional action was ever presented or voted upon in the Massachusetts legislature. A second hearing‡ was granted on February 28, 1884, before the Committee on Federal Relations. They reported leave to withdraw.

The associations mentioned are not the only ones that are aiding the suffrage movement. Its friends are found in all the women's clubs, temperance associations, missionary movements, charitable enterprises, educational and industrial unions and church committees. These agencies form a network of motive power which is gradually carrying the reform into all branches of public work.

The *Woman's Journal* was incorporated in 1870 and is owned by a joint stock company, shares being held by leading members of the suffrage associations of New England. Shortly after it was projected, the *Agitator*, then published in Chicago by Mary A. Livermore, was bought by the New England Association on condition that she should "come to Boston for one year, at a

* Two of these, Harriet H. Robinson nnd Harriette R. Shattuck, spoke at the first hearing before the Senate committee. It chanced that Mrs. Robinson was the first woman to speak before this Special Committee. The other delegates were: Mary R. Brown, Emma F. Clarry, Louisa E. Brooks, Mrs. G. W. Simonds, Sarah S. Eddy, Mr. and Mrs. D. W. Forbes, Mary H. Semple, Louisa A. Morrison and Cora B. Smart.

† The authors and compilers of these leaflets are Harriette R. Shattuck, Sara A. Underwood, Hannah M. Todd and Mary R. Brown.

‡ The speakers at these hearings were Harriette R. Shattuck, Mary R. Brown, Sidney D. Shattuck, Nancy W. Covell, Dr. Julia C. Smith, Mr. S. C. Fay, Louisa A. Morrison, Sara A. Underwood and Harriet H. Robinson.

Digitized by Google

reasonable compensation, to assist the cause by her editorial labor and speaking at conventions." Lucy Stone and Henry B. Blackwell, invited by the same society to "return to the work in Massachusetts," at once assumed the editorial charge. T. W. Higginson, Julia Ward Howe and W. L. Garrison were assistant editors. "Warrington," Kate N. Doggett, Samuel E. Sewall, F. B. Sanborn, and many other good writers, lent a helping hand to the new enterprise. The *Woman's Journal* has been of great value to the cause. It has helped individual women and brought their enterprises into public notice. It has opened its columns to inexperienced writers and advertised young speakers. To sustain the paper and furnish money for other work, two mammoth bazars or fairs were held in Music Hall in 1870, 1871. Nearly all the New England States and many of the towns in Massachusetts were represented by tables in these bazars. Donations were sent from all directions and the women worked, as they generally do in a cause in which they are interested, to raise money to furnish the sinews of war. The newspapers from day to day were full of descriptions of the splendors of the tables, and the reporters spoke well of the women who had taken this novel method to carry on their movement. People who had never heard of woman suffrage before came to see what sort of women were those who thus made a public exhibition of their zeal in this cause. In remote places, as well as nearer the scene of action, many people who had never thought of the significance of the woman's rights movement, began to consider it through reading the reports of the woman suffrage bazar.

Female opponents of the suffrage movement began to make a stir as early as 1868. A remonstrance was sent into the legislature, from two hundred women of Lancaster, giving the reasons why women should not enjoy the exercise of the elective franchise: "It would diminish the purity, the dignity and the moral influence of woman, and bring into the family circle a dangerous element of discord." In *The Revolution* of August 5, 1869, Parker Pillsbury said:

Dolly Chandler and the hundred and ninety-four other women who asked the Massachusetts legislature not to allow the right of suffrage, were very impudent and tyrannical, too, in petitioning for any but themselves. They should have said: "We, Dolly Chandler and her associates, to the number of a hundred and ninety-five in all, do not want the right of suffrage; and we pray your honorable bodies to so decree and enact that we shall never have it." So far they might go. But when they under-

Digitized by Google

take to prevent a hundred and ninety-four thousand other women who do want the ballot and who have an acknowledged right to it, and are laboring for it day and night, it is proper to ask, What business have Dolly Chandler and her little coterie to interpose? Nobody wants them to vote unless they themselves want to. They can stay at home and see nobody but the assessor, the tax-gatherer and the revenue collector, from Christmas to Christmas, if they so prefer. Those gentlemen they will be pretty likely to see, annually or quarterly, and to feel their power, too, if they have pockets with anything in them, in spite of all petitions to the legislature.

It did not occur to these women that by thus remonstrating they were doing just what they were protesting against. What *is* a vote? An expression of opinion or a desire as to governmental affairs, in the shape of a ballot. The "aspiring blood of Lancaster" should have mounted higher than this, since, if it really was the opinion of these remonstrants that woman cannot vote without becoming defiled, they should have kept themselves out of the legislature, should have kept their hands from petitioning and their thoughts from agitation on either side of the subject. Just such illogical reasoning on the woman suffrage question is often brought forward and passes for the profoundest wisdom and discreetest delicacy! The same arguments are used by the remonstrants of to-day, who are now fully organized and doing very efficient political work in opposing further political action by women. In their carriages, with footman and driver, they solicit names to their remonstrances. As a Boston newspaper says:

The anti-woman suffrage women get deeper and deeper into politics year by year in their determination to keep out of politics. By the time they triumph they will be the most accomplished politicians of the sex, and unable to stop writing to the papers, holding meetings, circulating remonstrances, any more than the suffrage sisterhood.

These persons, men and women, bring their whole force to bear before legislative committees at woman suffrage hearings, and use arguments that might have been excusable forty years ago. However this is merely a phase of the general movement and will work for good in the end. It can no more stop the progress of the reform than it can stop the revolution of the globe.

Political agitation on the woman suffrage question began in Massachusetts in 1870. A convention to discuss the feasibility of forming a woman suffrage political party was held in Boston, at which Julia Ward Howe presided, and Rev. Augusta Chapin offered

Digitized by Google

prayer. The question of a separate nomination for State officers was carefully considered.* Delegates were present from the Labor Reform and Prohibition parties, and strong efforts were made by them to induce the convention to nominate Wendell Phillips, who had already accepted the nomination of those two parties, as candidate for governor. The convention at one time seemed strongly in favor of this action, the women in particular thinking that in Mr. Phillips they would find a staunch and well tried leader. But more politic counsels prevailed, and it was finally concluded to postpone a separate nomination until after the Republican and Democratic conventions had been held. A State central committee was formed, and at once began active political agitation. A memorial was prepared to present to each of the last-named conventions; and the candidates on the State tickets of the four political parties were questioned by letter concerning their opinions on the right of the women to the ballot. At the Republican State convention held October 5, 1870, the question was fairly launched into politics, by the admission, for the first time, of two women, Lucy Stone and Mary A Livermore, as regularly accredited delegates. Both were invited to speak, and the following resolution drawn up by Henry B. Blackwell, was presented by Charles W. Slack:

Resolved, That the Republican party of Massachusetts is mindful of its obligations to the loyal women of America for their patriotic devotion to the cause of liberty; that we rejoice in the action of the recent legislature in making women eligible as officers of the State; that we thank Governor Claflin for having appointed women to important political trusts; that we are heartily in favor of the enfranchisement of women, and will hail the day when the educated, intelligent and enlightened conscience of the women of Massachusetts has direct expression at the ballot box.

This resolution was presented to the committee, who did not agree as to the propriety of reporting it to the convention, and they instructed their chairman, George F. Hoar, to state the fact and refer the resolution back to that body for its own action. A warm debate arose, in which several members of the convention made speeches on both sides of the question. The resolution was finally defeated, 137 voting in its favor, and 196 against it. Although lost, the large vote in the affirmative was thought to mean a great deal as a guaranty of the good faith of the Republican party, and the women were willing to trust to its promises. It was thought then, as it has been thought since, that most of the

* The speakers were Rev. J. T. Sargent, A. Bronson Alcott, H. B. Blackwell, Dr. Mercy B. Jackson, S. S. Foster, Mary A. Livermore, Rev. B. F. Bowles, F. B. Sanborn, W. S. Robinson, Gilbert Haven and many others.

Digitized by Google

friends of woman suffrage were in the Republican party, and that the interests of the cause could best be furthered by depending on its action. The women were, however, mistaken, and have learned to look upon the famous resolution in its true light. It is now known as the *coup d'état* of the Worcester convention of 1870, which really had more votes than it was fairly entitled to. After that,—"forewarned, forearmed," said the enemies of the enterprise, and woman suffrage resolutions have received less votes in Republican conventions.

When the memorial prepared by the State Central Committee was presented to the Democratic State convention, that body, in response, passed a resolution conceding the *principle* of women's right to suffrage, but at the same time declared itself against its being *enforced*, or put into practice. To finish the brief record of the dealings of the Democratic party, with the women of the State, it may be said that since 1870, it has never responded to their appeals, nor taken any action of importance on the question.

In 1871 a resolution endorsing woman suffrage was passed in the Republican convention. In June, 1872, the national convention at Philadelphia, passed the following:

Resolved, That the Republican party is mindful of its obligations to the loyal women of America for their noble devotion to the cause of freedom; their admission to wider fields of usefulness is viewed with satisfaction; and the honest demand of any class of citizens for additional rights, should be treated with respectful consideration.

The Massachusetts Republican State Convention, following this lead, again passed a woman suffrage resolution:

Resolved, That we heartily approve the recognition of the rights of woman contained in the fourteenth clause of the national Republican platform; that the Republican party of Massachusetts, as the representative of liberty and progress, is in favor of extending suffrage to all American citizens irrespective of sex, and will hail the day when the educated intellect and enlightened conscience of woman shall find direct expression at the ballot-box.

This was during the campaign of 1872, when General Grant's chance of reëlection was thought to be somewhat uncertain, and the Republican women in all parts of the country were called on to rally to his support. The National Woman Suffrage Association had issued "an appeal to the women of America," asking them to coöperate with the Republican party and work for the election of its candidates. In response to this appeal a ratification meeting was held at Tremont Temple, in Boston, at which hundreds stayed to a late hour listening to speeches made by women on the political questions of the day. An address was issued from

Digitized by Google

the "Republican women of Massachusetts to the women of America." In this address they announced their faith in and willingness to "trust the Republican party and its candidates, as saying what they mean and meaning what they say, and in view of their honorable record we have no fear of betrayal on their part." Mrs. Livermore, Lucy Stone and Huldah B. Loud took part in the canvass, and agents employed by the Massachusetts Association were instructed to speak for the Republican party.* Women writers furnished articles for the newspapers and the Republican women did as much effective work during the campaign as if each one had been a "man and a voter." They did everything but vote. All this agitation was a benefit to the Republican party, but not to woman suffrage, because for a time it arrayed other political parties against the movement and caused it to be thought merely a party issue, while it is too broad a question for such limitation.

General Grant was reëlected and the campaign was over. When the legislature met and the suffrage question came up for discussion, that body, composed in large majority of Republicans, showed the women of Massachusetts the difference between "saying what you mean and meaning what you say," the Woman Suffrage bill being defeated by a large majority. The women learned by this experience that nothing is to be expected of a political party while it is in power. To close the subject of suffrage resolutions in the platform of the Republican party, it may be said that they continued to be put in and seemed to mean something until after 1875, when they became only "glittering generalities," and were as devoid of real meaning or intention as any that were ever passed by the old Whig party on the subject of abolition. Yet from 1870 to 1874 the Republican party had the power to fulfill its promises on this question. Since then, it has been too busy trying to keep breath in its own body to lend a helping hand to any struggling reform. At the Republican convention, held in Worcester in 1880, an attempt was made by Mr. Blackwell to introduce a resolution endorsing the

* In the records of the executive meetings of this Association I find the following votes. In October, 1872, it was voted, That any invitation to speak at Republican meetings, extended to our agents by Republican committees in this State, be accepted by them until the coming election, their usual salaries being paid by this Association; that Miss Loud be notified by Lucy Stone of our arrangement in regard to Republican meetings, and be requested, after the 15th instant, to hold her meetings in that manner as far as practicable; that the balance of expenses of the woman's meeting held at Tremont Temple be paid by this Association. [This was a political meeting held by the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association to endorse General Grant as the presidential candidate of the Republican party.]

Digitized by Google

right conferred upon women in the law allowing them to vote for school committees, passed by the legislature of 1879. This resolution was rejected by the committee, and when offered in convention as an amendment, it was voted down without a single voice, except that of the mover, being raised in its support. Yet this resolution only asked a Republican convention to endorse an existing right, conferred on the women of the State by a Republican legislature! A political party as a party of freedom must be very far spent when it refuses at its annual convention to endorse an act passed by a legislature the majority of whose members are representatives elected from its own body. Since that time the Republican party has entirely ignored the claims of woman. In 1884, at its annual convention, an effort was made, as usual, by Mr. Blackwell, to introduce a resolution, but without success, and yet some of the best of our leaders advised the women to "stand by the Republican party." *

The question of forming a woman suffrage political party had, since 1870, been often discussed.† In 1875 Thomas J. Lothrop proposed the formation of a separate organization. But it was not until 1876 that any real effort in this direction was made. The Prohibitory (or Temperance) party sometimes holds the balance of political power in Massachusetts, and many of the members of that party are also strong advocates of suffrage. The feeling had been growing for several years that if forces could be joined with the Prohibitionists some practical result in politics might be reached, and though there was a difference of opinion on this subject, many were willing to see the experiment tried.

The Prohibitory party had at its convention in 1876 passed a resolution inviting the women to take part in its primary meetings, with an equal voice and vote in the nomination of candidates and transaction of business. After long and anxious discussions, the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage State Central Committee, in whose hands all political action rested, determined to accept this invitation. A woman suffrage political convention was held, at which the Prohibitory candidates were endorsed and

* The National Association of Massachusetts at its executive session, August 23, passed the following:

Resolved, That while we respect the advice of our leaders, as their private political opinion, we deem it worse than useless to "stand by the Republican" or any other party while we are deprived of the only means of enforcing a political opinion; and that we advise all associations to concentrate their efforts upon securing the ballot to women, withholding all attempt at political influence until they possess the right which alone can make their influence effective.

† At the executive meeting of the New England Association, May, 1874, it was voted that a circular be sent to the friends of woman suffrage, requesting them to meet in Boston, May 25, to consider the expediency of calling a convention to form a political party for woman suffrage.

Digitized by Google

a joint State ticket was decided on, to be headed "Prohibition and Equal Rights." These tickets were sent to women all over the State, and they were strongly urged to go to the polls and distribute them on election day. Lucy Stone, Mary A. Livermore and other leading speakers took part in the campaign, and preparations were completed by which it was expected both parties would act harmoniously together. Clubs were formed at whose headquarters were seen men and women gathered together to organize for political work. From some of these headquarters hung transparencies with "Baker and Eddy" on one side, and "Prohibition and Equal Rights" on the other. Caucuses and conventions were held in Chelsea, Taunton, Malden, Lynn, Concord, and other places. A Middlesex county (first district) senatorial convention was called and organized by women, and its proceedings were fully reported by the Boston newspapers.*

The nominations made at these caucuses were generally unanimous, and it seemed at the time as if the two wings of the so-called "Baker party" would work harmoniously together. But, with a few honorable exceptions, the Prohibitionists, taking advantage of the fact that the voting power of the women was over, once outside the caucus, repudiated the nominations, or held other caucuses and shut the doors of entrance in the faces of the women who represented either the suffrage or the Prohibitory party. This was the case invariably, excepting in towns where the majority of the voting members of the Prohibitory party were also in favor of woman suffrage. This result is what might have been expected. Of what use was woman in the ranks of *any* political party, with no vote outside the caucus?

After being thus ignored in one of their caucuses in Malden, Middlesex county, the suffragists in that town determined to hold another caucus. This was accordingly done, and two "straight" candidates were nominated as town representatives to the legislature. A "Woman Suffrage ticket" † was thereupon printed to offer to the voters on election day. The next question was, who would distribute these ballots

* The call for this convention was signed by Harriet H. Robinson, Rev. A. D. Sargent, Rev. G. H. Vibbert, William Johnson, Mrs. T. R. Woodman, Helen Gale and Mrs. M. Slocum. Judge Robert C. Pitman was the candidate for governor.

† This "Woman Suffrage ticket," the first ever offered to a Massachusetts voter, received 41 votes out of the 1,340 cast in all by the voters of the town, a larger proportion than that first cast by the old Liberty party in Massachusetts, which began with only 307 votes in the whole State, and ended in the Free Soil and Republican parties.

Digitized by Google

most effectively at the polls. Some men thought that the women themselves should go and present in person the names of their candidates. At first the women who had carried on the campaign shrank from this last test of their faithfulness; but, after carefully considering the matter, they concluded that it was the right thing to do. The repugnance felt at that time, at the thought of "women going to the polls" can hardly be appreciated to-day. Since they have begun to vote in Massachusetts the terror expressed at the idea of such a proceeding has somewhat abated; but in 1876 it was thought to be a rash act for a woman to appear at the polls in company with men. Some attempt was made to deter them from their purpose, and stories of pipes and tobacco and probable insults were told; but they had no terrors for women who knew better than to believe that their neighbors would be turned into beasts (like the man in the fairy tale) for this one day in the year.*

It was a sight to be remembered, to behold women "crowned with honor" standing at the polls to see the freed slave go by and vote, and the newly-naturalized fellow-citizen, and the blind, the paralytic, the boy of twenty-one with his newly-fledged vote, the drunken man who did not know Hayes from Tilden, and the man who read his ballot upside down. All these voted for the men they wanted to represent them, but the women, being neither colored, nor foreign, nor blind, nor paralytic, nor newly-fledged, nor drunk, nor ignorant, but only *women*, could not vote for the men they wanted to represent them.†

The women learned several things during this campaign in Massachusetts. One was, that weak parties are no more to be trusted than strong ones; and another, that men grant but little until the ballot is placed in the hands of those who make the demand. They learned also how political caucuses and conventions are managed. The resolution passed by the Prohibitionists enabled them to do this. So the great "open sesame" is reached. It is but fair to state that since 1876 the Prohibitory party has

* Election day dawned and it rained hard, but the women braved the storm. There they stood from 9 o'clock A. M. till a quarter of 5 P. M. and distributed votes, only leaving their positions long enough to get a cup of coffee and a luncheon, which was provided at the headquarters. They distributed 1,700 woman suffrage ballots and 1,000 circulars containing arguments on the rights of women. They were treated with unexceptionable politeness and kindness by the voters.

† The first time women went to the polls in Massachusetts was in 1870, when forty-two women of Hyde Park, led by Angelina Grimké Weld and Sarah Grimké, deposited their ballots, in solemn protest "against the political ostracism of women, against leaving every vital interest of a majority of the citizens to the monopoly of a male minority." It is hardly needful to record that these ballots were not counted.

Digitized by Google

treated the woman suffrage question with consideration. In its annual convention it has passed resolutions endorsing woman's claims to political equality, and has set the example to other parties of admitting women as delegates. At the State convention in 1885 the following resolution was adopted by a good majority:

Resolved, That women having interests to be promoted and rights to be protected, and having ability for the discharge of political duties, should have the right to vote and to be voted for, as is accorded to man.

In the early history of Massachusetts, when the new colony was governed by laws set down in the Province charter (1691; third year of William and Mary) women were not excluded from voting. The clause in the charter relating to this matter says:

The great and general court shall consist of the governor and council (or assistants for the time being) and of such freeholders as shall be from time to time elected or deputed by the major part of the freeholders and other inhabitants of the respective towns or places, who shall be present at such elections.

In the original constitution (1780) women were excluded from voting except for certain State officers.* In the constitutional convention of 1820, the word "male" was first put into the constitution of the State, in an amendment to define the qualifications of voters. In this convention, a motion was made at three different times, during the passage of the act, to strike out the intruding word, but the motion was voted down. Long before the second attempt was made to revise the constitution of the State, large numbers of women began to demand suffrage. Woman's sphere of operations and enterprise had become so widened, that they felt they had not only the right, but also an increasing fitness for civil life and government, of which the ballot is but the sign and the symbol.

In the constitutional convention of 1853, twelve petitions were presented, from over 2,000 adult persons, asking for the recognition of woman's right to the ballot, in the proposed amendments to the constitution of the State. The committee reported leave to withdraw, giving as their reason that the "consent of the governed" was shown by the small number of petitioners. Hearings before this committee were granted.† The chairman of this committee, in presenting the report, moved that all debate on the subject should cease in thirty minutes, and on motion of

* For summary of voting laws relating to women from 1691 to 1822, see "Massachusetts in the Woman Suffrage Movement," by Harriet H. Robinson: Roberts Brothers, Boston.

† Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Lucy Stone, Theodore Parker, Wendell Phillips, and other speakers of ability, presented able arguments in favor of giving women the right to vote.

Benjamin F. Butler of Lowell, the whole report, excepting the last clause, was stricken out. There was then left of the whole document (including more than two closely-printed pages of reasoning) only this: "It is inexpedient for this convention to take any action."

Legislative action on the woman's rights question began in 1849, when William Lloyd Garrison presented the first petition on the subject to the State legislature. Following him was one from Jonathan Drake and others, "for a peaceable secession of Massachusetts from the Union." Both these petitions were probably considered by the legislature to which they were addressed as of equally incendiary character, since they both had "leave to withdraw." In 1851 an order was introduced asking "whether any legislation was necessary concerning the wills of married women?" In 1853 a bill was enacted "to exempt certain property of widows and unmarried women from taxation." In the legislature of 1856 the first great and important act relating to the property rights of women was passed. It was to the effect that women could hold all property earned or acquired independently of their husbands. This act was amended and improved the next session.

In 1857 a hearing was held before the Committee on the Judiciary to listen to arguments in favor of the petition of Lucy Stone and others for equal property rights for women and for the "right of suffrage." Another hearing was held in the same place in February, 1858, before the Joint Special Committee on the Qualifications of Voters. A second hearing on the right of suffrage for women was held the following week before the same committee. Thomas W. Higginson made an address and Caroline Healey Dall read an essay.

In 1858, Stephen A. Chase of Salem, from the same Committee on the Qualifications of Voters, made a long report on the petitions. This report closed with an order that the State Board of Education make inquiry and report to the next legislature "whether it is not practicable and expedient to provide by law some method by which the women of this State may have a more active part in the control and management of the schools." There is nothing in legislative records to show that the State Board of Education reported favorably; but from the above statement it appears that ten years before Samuel E. Sewall's petition

Digitized by Google

on the subject, a movement was made towards making women "eligible to serve as members of school-committees."

The petitions for woman's rights were usually circulated by women going from house to house. They did the drudgery, endured the hardships and suffered the humiliations attendant upon the early history of our cause; but their names are forgotten, and others reap the benefit of their labors. These women were so modest and so anxious for the success of their petitions, that they never put their own names at the head of the list, preferring the signature of some leading man, so that others seeing his name, might be induced to follow his example. Among the earliest of these silent workers was Mary Upton Ferrin. Her petitions were for a change in the laws concerning the property rights of married women, and for the political and legal rights of all women. In 1849 she prepared a memorial to the Massachusetts legislature in which are embodied many of the demands for woman's equality before the law, which have so often been made to that body since that time.*

In 1861 the legislature debated a bill to allow a widow, "if she have woodland as a part of her dower, the privilege of cutting wood enough for one fire." This bill failed, and the widow, by law, was *not* allowed to keep herself warm with fuel from her own wood-lot. In 1863 a bill providing that "a wife may be allowed to be a witness and proceed against her husband for desertion," was reported inexpedient, and a bill was passed to *prevent* women from forming copartnerships in business. In 1865, Gov. John A. Andrew, seeing the magnitude of the approaching woman question, in his annual message to the legislature, made a memorable suggestion:

> I know of no more useful object to which the commonwealth can lend its aid, than that of a movement, adopted in a practical way, to open the door of emigration to young women who are wanted for teachers and for every appropriate, as well as domestic, employment in the remote West, but who are leading anxious and aimless lives in New England.

By the "anxious and aimless" it was supposed the governor meant the widowed, single or otherwise unrepresented portion of

* This memorial was printed by order of the legislature (Leg. Doc. Ho. 57) and is called "Memorial of the Female Signers of the Several Petitions of Henry A. Hardy and Others," presented March 1, 1849. The document is not signed and Mrs. Ferrin's name is not found with it upon the records, neither does her name appear in the journal of the House in connection with any of the petitions and addresses she caused to be presented to the legislature of the State. But for the loyal friendship of the few who knew of her work and were willing to give her due credit, the name of Mary Upton Ferrin [see Vol. I., page 208] and the memory of her labors as well as those of many another silent worker, would have gone into the "great darkness."

Digitized by Google

the citizens of the State. No action was taken by the legislature on this portion of the governor's message. But a member of the Senate actually made the following proposition before that body:

That the "anxious and aimless women" of the State should assemble on the Common on a certain day of the year (to be hereafter named), and that Western men who wanted wives, should be invited to come here and select them.

Legislators who make such propositions, do not foresee that the time may come, when perhaps those nearest and dearest to them, may be classed among the superfluous or "anxious and aimless" women!

In 1865 bills allowing married women to testify in suits at law where their husbands are parties, and permitting them to hold trust estates were rejected. It will be seen that though all this legislation was adverse to woman's interest, the question had forced itself upon the attention of the members of both House and Senate. In 1866 a joint committee of both houses was appointed to consider:

If any additional legislation can be adopted, whereby the means of obtaining a livelihood by the women of this commonwealth may be increased and a more equal and just compensation be allowed for their labor.

In 1867, Francis W. Bird presented the petition of Mehitable Haskell of Gloucester for "an amendment to the constitution extending suffrage to women." In 1868 Mr. King of Boston presented the same petition, and it was at this time, and in answer thereto, that the subject first entered into the regular orders of the day, and became a part of the official business of the House of Representatives. Attempts to legislate on the property question were continued in 1868, in bills "to further protect the property of married women," "to allow married women to contract for necessaries," and if "divorced from bed and board, to allow them to dispose of their own property." These bills were all defeated. Annual legislative hearings on woman suffrage began in 1869. These were first secured through the efforts of the executive committee of the New England Woman Suffrage Association. Eight thousand women had petitioned the legislature that suffrage might be allowed them on the same terms as men, and in answer, two hearings were held in the green room at the State House.* In 1870 a joint special committee on woman suffrage

* The committee was addressed by Wendell Phillips, Julia Ward Howe, Lucy Stone, Rev. James Freeman Clarke and Hon. George F. Hoar.

Digitized by Google

was formed, and since that time there have been one or more annual hearings on the question. To what extent legislative sentiment has been created will be shown later in the improvement of many laws with regard to the legal status of woman.

William Claflin was the first governor of Massachusetts to present officially to the voters of the commonwealth the subject of woman's rights as a citizen. In his address to the legislature of 1871, he strongly recommended a change in the laws regarding suffrage and the property rights of woman. His attitude toward this reform made an era in the history of the executive department of the State. Since that time nearly every governor of the State has, in his annual message, recommended the subject to respectful consideration. In 1879 Governor Thomas Talbot proposed a constitutional amendment which should secure the ballot to women on the same terms as to men. In response to this portion of the governor's message, and to the ninety-eight petitions presented on the subject, a general suffrage bill passed the Senate by a two-thirds majority, and an act to "give women the right to vote for members of school committees," passed both branches of the legislature and became a law of the State.* Governor John D. Long, in his inaugural address before the legislature of 1880, expressed his opinion in favor of woman suffrage perhaps more decidedly than any who had preceded him in that high official position. He said:

> I repeat my conviction of the right of woman suffrage. If the commonwealth is not ready to give it in full by a constitutional amendment, I approve of testing it in municipal elections.

The law allowing women to vote for school committees is one of the last results of the legislative agitations, though it is true that the petition, the answer to which was the passage of this act, did not emanate from any suffrage association. It was the outcome of a conference on the subject, held in the parlors of the New England Women's Club.†

But the petitions of the suffragists had always been for general and unrestricted suffrage, and they opposed any scheme for securing the ballot on a class or a restricted basis, holding that the true ground of principle is equality of rights with man. The

* Two years before (1869), while sitting as visitor in the gallery of the House of Representatives, I heard the whole subject of woman's rights referred to the (bogus) committee on graveyards!

† It was perhaps intended to serve as a means of reinstating Abby W. May and other women who had been defeated as candidates for reëlection on the Boston school-board. The names of Isa E. Gray, Mrs. C. B. Richmond, Elizabeth P. Peabody and John M. Forbes led the lists of petitioners.

Digitized by Google

practical result, so far, of voting for school committees has justified this position; for, as shown by the recent elections, the women of the State have not availed themselves to any extent of their new right to vote, and, therefore, the measure has not forwarded the cause of general suffrage. In fact, the school-committee question is not a vital one with either male or female voters, and it is impossible to get up any enthusiasm on the subject. As a test question upon which to try the desire of the women of the State to become voters, it is a palpable sham. Our Revolutionary fathers would not have fought, bled and died for such a figment of a right as this; and their daughters, or grand-daughters, inherit the same spirit, and if they vote at all, want something worth voting for. The result is, that the voting has been largely done by those women who have long been in favor of suffrage, and who have gone to the polls on election day from pure principle and a sense of duty.*

The law allowing women to vote for school committees was very elastic and capable of many interpretations. It reminded one of the old school exercise in transposing the famous line in Gray's Elegy,

"The ploughman homeward plods his weary way,"

which has been found to be capable of over twenty different transpositions. The collectors and registrars in some towns and cities took advantage of this obscurity of expression, and interpreted the law according to their individual opinion on the woman suffrage question. In places where these officials were in sympathy, a broad construction was put upon the provisions of the law, the poll-tax payers were allowed to vote upon the payment of one dollar (under the divided tax law of 1879), and the women voters generally were given all necessary information, and treated courteously both by the assessors and registrars and at the polls. In places where leading officials were opposed to women's voting, the case was far different. Without regarding the clause in the law which said that a woman may vote upon paying either State or county poll-tax, such officials have threatened the women with arrest when they refused to pay both. In some towns they have been treated with great indignity, as if they were doing an unlawful act. In one town the women were actually required to pay a poll-tax the second year, in spite of the clause in the law

* At the first annual election for school committees in cities and towns in 1879–80, about 5,000 women became registered voters.

Digitized by Google

that a female citizen who has paid a State or county tax within two years shall have the right to vote. The town assessor, whose duty it was to inform the women on this point of the law when asked concerning the matter, *willfully* withheld the desired information, saying he "did not know," though he afterwards said that he *did* know, but intended to let the women "find out for themselves." This assessor forgot that the women, as legal voters, had a right to ask for this information, and that by virtue of his official position he was legally obliged to answer. In another town two ladies who were property tax-payers were made to pay the two dollars poll-tax, and the record of this still stands on the town books. Some ladies were frightened and paid the tax under protest; others ran the risk. Here is a letter addressed to a lady 83 years of age:

MALDEN, Dec. 2, 1879.

HARRIET HANSON: There is a balance of ninety cents due on your poll-tax of 1879, duly assessed upon you. Payment of the same is hereby demanded, and if not paid within fourteen days from this date, with twenty cents for the summons, the collector is required to proceed forthwith to collect the same in manner provided by law.

THEODORE N. FOGUE, *Collector.*

Mrs. Hanson paid no attention to the summons, and that was the end of it.

In 1881, under the amended act the poll-tax was reduced to fifty cents, and the property tax-paying women (who are not required to pay a poll-tax) are no longer obliged to make a return of property exempt from taxation, as was required under the original statute. Though some of the disabilities were removed, yet the privileges are no greater; and it is for members of school-committees and for nothing else, that the women of this State can vote. This is hardly worthy to be called "school suffrage"! It is to be regretted that a better test than that of school-committee suffrage, could not have been given to the women of the State, so that the issue of what under the circumstances cannot be called a fair trial of their desire to vote, might be more nearly what the friends of reform had desired.

The first petition to the Massachusetts legislature, asking that women might be allowed to serve on school-boards was presented in 1866 by Samuel E. Sewall of Boston. The same petition was again presented in 1867. About this time Ashfield and Monroe, two of the smallest towns in the State, elected women as members of the school committee. Worcester and Lynn soon

Digitized by Google

followed the good example, and in 1874, Boston, for the first time, chose six women to serve in this capacity.* There had hitherto been no open objection to this innovation, but the school committee of Boston not liking the idea of women co-workers, declared them ineligible to hold such office. Miss Peabody applied to the Supreme Court for its opinion upon the matter, but the judges refused to answer, and dismissed the petition on the ground that the school committee itself had power to decide the question of the qualifications of members of the board. The subject was brought before the legislature of the same year, and that body, almost unanimously, passed "An Act to Declare Women Eligible to Serve as Members of School Committees." Thus the women members were reïnstated.†

This refusal on the part of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts to answer a question relating to woman's rights under the law, was received with a knowing smile by those who remembered the three adverse decisions relating to women which had been given by that august body. The first of these was on the case of Sarah E. Wall of Worcester. The second was concerning a clause in the will of Francis Jackson of Boston, who left $5,000 and other property to the woman's rights cause. Its third adverse decision was given in 1871. In that year, Julia Ward Howe and Mary E. Stevens were appointed by Governor Claflin as justices of the peace. Some member of the governor's council having doubted whether women could legally hold the office, the opinion of the Supreme Court was asked and it decided substantially that because women were women, or because women were not *men*, they could *not* be justices of the peace; and the appointment was not confirmed.

Changes in the common law began in 1845 with reference to the wife's right to hold her own property. In 1846 she could legally sign a receipt for money earned or deposited by herself.‡ Before 1855 a woman could not hold her own property, either earned or acquired by inheritance. If unmarried, she was ob-

* Lucretia P. Hale, Abby W. May, Lucia M. Peabody, Mary J. S. Blake, Kate G. Wells, Lucretia Crocker.

† This act, so brief and so *expressive*, is worthy to be remembered. It simply reads: "*Be it enacted, etc., as follows*

SEC. 1. No person shall be deemed ineligible to serve upon a school committee by reason of sex.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its passage. (*Approved June 30, 1874.*)

By force of habit, the legislature said not a word in the law about *women*. There are now (1885) 108 women members of school-boards in Massachusetts.

‡ See "Women under the law of Massachusetts," Henry H. Sprague. Boston: W. B. Clarke & Carruth.

Digitized by Google

liged to place it in the hands of a trustee, to whose will she was subject. If she contemplated marriage, and desired to call her property her own, she was forced by law to make a contract with her intended husband, by which she gave up all title or claim to it. A woman, either married or unmarried, could hold no office of trust or power. She was not a person. She was not recognized as a citizen. She was not a factor in the human family. She was not a unit; but a zero, a nothing, in the sum of civilization.

To-day, a married woman can hold her own property, if it is held or bought in her own name, and can make a will disposing of it. A man is no longer the sole heir of his wife's property. A married woman can make contracts, enter into co-partnerships, carry on business, invest her own earnings for her own use and behoof,—and she is also responsible for her own debts. She can be executor, administrator, guardian or trustee. She can testify in the courts for or against her husband. She can release, transfer, or convey, any interest she may have in real estate, subject only to the life interest which the husband may have at her death. Thirty years ago, when the woman's rights movement began, the status of a married woman was little better than that of a domestic servant. By the English common law, her husband was her lord and master. He had the sole custody of her person, and of her minor children. He could "punish her with a stick no bigger than his thumb," and she could not complain against him.*

The common law of this State held man and wife to be one person, but that person was the husband. He could by will deprive her of every part of his property, and also of what had been her own before marriage. He was the owner of all her real estate and of her earnings. The wife could make no contract and no will, nor, without her husband's consent, dispose of the legal interest of her real estate. He had the income of her real estate till she died, and if they ever had a living child his ownership of the

* The authority for this old "thumb" tradition, that "a man had a right to whip his wife with a stick no bigger than his thumb," is found in an early edition of *Phillips' Evidence*. That book was authority in English common law and in it Phillips is quoted as saying, that according to the law of his day a husband "might lawfully chastise his wife with a reasonable weapon, as a *broomstick*," adding, however, "but if he use an unreasonable weapon, such as an iron bar, and death ensue, it would be murder."—[Chamberlin, p. 818.] But the real "thumb" story seems to have originated with a certan Judge Buller of England, who lived about one hundred years ago. In his ruling on one of those cases of wife-beating, now so common in our police courts, he said that a man had a right to punish his wife, "with a stick no bigger than his thumb." That was his opinion. Shortly after this some ladies sent the judge a letter in which they prayed him to give them the size of his thumb! We are not told whether he complied with their request.

Digitized by Google

real estate continued to his death. He could forbid her to buy a loaf of bread or a pound of sugar, or contract for a load of wood to keep the family warm. She did not own a rag of her own clothing. She had no personal rights, and could hardly call her soul her own.

Her husband could steal her children, rob her of her clothing, and her earnings, neglect to support the family; and she had no legal redress. If a wife earned money by her labor, the husband could claim the pay as his share of the proceeds. There is a clause sometimes found in old wills, to the effect that if a widow marry again, she shall forfeit all right to her husband's property. The most conservative judge in the commonwealth would now rule that a widow cannot be kept from her fair share of the property, by any such unjust restriction. In a husband's eyes of a hundred and fifty years ago, a woman's mission was accomplished after she had been *his* wife and borne *his* children. What more could be desired of her, he argued, but a corner somewhere in which, respectably dressed as his *relict*, she could sit down and mourn for him, for the rest of her life.*

The law no longer sanctions such a will, but provides that the widow shall have a fair share of all personal property. If a widow permits herself to-day to be defrauded of her legal rights in the division of property, it is her own fault, and because she does not study and understand for herself the general statutes of Massachusetts, and the laws concerning the rights of married women. The result of thirty years of property legislation for women is well stated by Mr. Sewall in his admirable pamphlet, in which he says, "the last thirty years have done more to improve the law for married women than the four hundred preceding." The legislature has, during this time, enacted laws allowing women to vote in parishes and religious societies, declaring that women *must* become members of the board of trustees of the three State primary and reform schools, of the State workhouse, of the State almshouse at Tewksbury, and of the board of prison commissioners; also, that certain officers and managers of the reformatory prison for women at Sherborn "shall be women." Without legislation, women now are school supervisors, overseers of the poor, trustees of public libraries and members of the State

* In an old will, made a hundred and fifty years ago, a husband of large means bequeathed to his "dearly beloved wife" $50 and a new suit of clothes, with the injunction that she should return to her original, or family home. And with this small sum, as her share of his property, he returned her to her parents.

Digitized by Google

Board of Education and of the State Board of Health, Lunacy and Charity.*

These great changes in legislation for the women of Massachusetts are the result of their own labors. By conventions and documents they have informed the people and enlightened public sentiment. By continued agitation the question has been kept prominently before their representatives in the legislature. And, though so much has been gained, they are still hard at work, nor will they rest until, woman's equality with man before the law is firmly established.

Among the most important acts passed recently is one of 1879, by which a married woman is the owner of her own clothing to the value of $2,000, although the act granting this calls such apparel the "gifts of her husband," not recognizing the fact that most married women earn or help to earn their own clothes. A law was passed, in 1881, to "mitigate the evils of divorce." Two important acts were passed by the legislature of 1882, one allowing women to become practising attorneys, and the other providing, that in case of the death of a married woman intestate and leaving children, one-half only of her personal estate shall go to her husband, instead of the whole, as in previous years. In 1883, a wife was given the right of burial in any lot or tomb belonging to her husband. In 1884, the only measures were a bill providing for the appointment of women on the board of State lunatic hospitals, and another providing for the appointment of women assistant physicians in the same hospitals, and an act giving women the power to dispose of their separate estates by will or deed. In 1885, very little was done to improve the legal status of women.

When any vote on the Suffrage bill is taken, it is enough to make the women who sit in the gallery weep to hear the "O's" and the "Mc's," almost to a man, thunder forth the emphatic "*No!*"; and to think that these men (some of whom a few years ago were walking over their native bogs, with hardly the right to live and breathe) should vote away so thoughtlessly the rights of the women of the country in which they have found a shelter and a home. When they came to this country, poor,

* The little actual gain in votes since 1874, in favor of municipal or general suffrage for women, might cause the careless observer to draw the inference that no great progress had been made in legislative sentiment during all these years. In 1879 the vote in the House of Representatives on the General Woman Suffrage Bill was 133 to 68. In 1885 the bill giving municipal suffrage was defeated in the House by a vote of 130 to 61. But this is not a true index of the progress of public opinion.

and with no inheritance but the "shillalah," the ballot was freely given to them, as the poor man's weapon for defence. Why cannot men, who have been political serfs in their own country, see the incongruity of voting against the enfranchisement of over one-half of the inhabitants of the State which has made free human beings of them? It is not long since one of these adopted citizens, in a discussion, said:

When the women show that they want to vote, I am willing to give them all the rights they want.

Give! I thought. Where did you get the right to *give* Massachusetts women the right to vote? You did not inherit it. In what consists your prerogative over the women whose ancestors fought to secure the very right of suffrage of which you so glibly talk, and which neither you, nor your father before you, did aught to establish or maintain?

The improvement in the social or general condition of woman has been even greater than that in legislation. Previous to 1840, women were employed only as teachers of summer schools, to "spell the men" during the haying season; and this only occasionally. They held no responsible position in any public school in the State. To-day there are eight women to one man employed in all grades of this profession, and there are numerous instances where women are head-teachers of departments, or principals of high, normal and grammar schools. Previous to 1825, girls could attend only the primary schools of Boston. Through the influence of Rev. John Pierpont, the first high-school for girls was opened in that city. There was a great outcry against this innovation; and, because of the excitement on the subject, and the *great number of girls* who applied for admission, the scheme was abandoned. The public-school system, as it is now called, was established in Boston in 1789; boys were admitted the whole year round; girls, from April to October. This inequality in the opportunities for education roused John Pierpont's indignation, and moved him to make strenuous efforts to secure justice for girls. Now there are 6,246 schools, seventy-two academies, six normal schools, two colleges, Boston University and the "Harvard Annex" all open to girls. In the town of Plymouth, where the Pilgrim fathers and mothers first landed, when the question whether girls should receive any public instruction first came up in town-meeting, there was great opposition to it. However, the majority showed a liberal spirit, and voted

Digitized by Google

to give the girls one hour of instruction daily. This was in 1793. In 1853 a normal school for girls was established in Boston; in 1855 its name was changed to the Girls' High and Normal School. In 1878 the Girls' Latin School in Boston was founded. The establishment of this successful institution was the result of discussions on the subject first brought before the public by ladies of Boston. High schools in almost all the towns and cities of the State have long been established, in which the boys and girls are educated together. In 1880 the pupils in the high and normal schools of Boston were about 2,000 girls to 1,000 boys. In 1867 the Lowell Institute and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology advertised classes free to both sexes in French, mathematics and in practical science.* Since that time Chauncy Hall School and Boston University have been opened to women, with the equal privileges of male students. It might be explained here that the "Harvard Annex," or "Private Collegiate Instruction for Women," is not an organic part of the University itself. Under a certain arrangement, a limited number of young women are allowed a few of the privileges of the young men. They are also permitted to use all the books belonging to the library and to attend many of the lectures. No college-building is appropriated for this purpose, but recitation-rooms are provided in private houses. A witty Cambridge lady called this mythical college the "Harvard Annex"; the public adopted the name, and many people suppose that there is such a building. From the last annual report of the "Private Collegiate Instruction for Women," it appears that in 1885 sixty-five women availed themselves of the privilege of attending this course of instruction.† Three-fourths of this number are Massachusetts girls. Some of the professors say that the average of scholarship there is higher than in the University. Fifty courses of studies are open to women students. Miss Brown of Concord, a graduate of 1884, astonished the faculty by her high per cent. in the classics. Her average was higher than that reached by any young man. These students go unattended to the lectures and to the library of the college. A great change indeed,

* Mrs. Ellen M. Richards was the first woman who entered.

† The Harvard Annex, so called, began its seventh year with sixty-five young ladies enrolled for study. The enrollment for the preceeding six years was as follows: First year, 29: second, 47; third 40; fourth, 39; fifth, 49, sixth, 55. Some of the students come from distant places, but a majority are from the Cambridge and neighboring high-schools. The institution occupies this year for the first time a building which has been conveniently arranged for its purposes. The endowment of the association which manages the work now amounts to $85,000.

Digitized by Google

since the time when women began to attend the Lowell Institute lectures! Then it was thought almost disgraceful to go to a public meeting without male protection, and they went with veiled faces, as if ashamed to be seen of men. The "Annex" has some advantages, but they cannot compare with Girton and Newnham of Cambridge, England.

The treasurer of the "Harvard Annex" declares the great need that exists for funds to provide a suitable building, etc., for the numerous women who continue to apply there for admission; and he appeals to the generosity of the public for contributions of money to be used for this purpose. The casual observer might suggest that those women who will hereafter become the benefactors of this university should remember the needs of their own sex, and leave their donations or bequests so that they can be used for the benefit of the "Harvard Annex," which is a wholly private enterprise, conducted by the University instructors and supervised by a committee of ladies.

Colleges for women have also been founded. Wellesley and Smith have long been doing good university work. Thirty years ago there was no college in the country, except Oberlin, to which women were admitted. To-day, even conservative Harvard begins to melt a little under this regenerating influence, and invites women, through the doors of its "Annex," to come and enjoy some of the privileges found within its sacred halls of learning. This was a late act of grace from a college whose inception was in the mind of a woman * longing for a better oppor-

* This lady was Lucy Downing, a sister of the first governor of Massachusetts. She was the wife of Emanuel Downing, a lawyer of the Inner Temple, a friend of Governor Winthrop and afterward a man of mark in the infant colony. In a letter to her brother, Lucy Downing expresses the desire of herself and husband to come to New England with their children, but laments that if they do come her son George cannot complete his studies. She says: "You have yet noe societies nor means of that kind for the education of youths in learning. It would make me goe far nimbler to New England, if God should call me to it, than otherwise I should, and I believe a colledge would put noe small life into the plantation." This letter was written early in 1636, and in October of the same year the General Court of the Massachusetts colony agreed to give £400 towards establishing a school or college in Newtowne (two years later called Cambridge). Soon afterwards Rev. John Harvard died and left one-half of his estate to this "infant seminary," and in 1638 it was ordered by the General Court that the "Colledge to be built at Cambridge shall be called Harvard Colledge."

Early in 1638 Lucy Downing and her husband arrived in New England, and the name of George Downing stands second on the list of the first class of Harvard graduates in 1642. The Downings had other sons who do not seem to have been educated at Harvard, and daughters who were put out to service. The son for whom so much was done by his mother, was afterwards known as Sir George Downing, and he became rich and powerful in England. Downing street in London is named for him. In after life he forgot his duty to his mother, who so naturally looked to him for support; and her last letter written from England after her husband died, when she was old and feeble, tells a sad story of her son's avarice and meanness, and leaves the painful impression that she suffered in her old age for the necessaries of life.

It is hard to estimate how much influence the earnest longing of this one woman for the better edution of her son, had in the founding of this earliest college in Massachusetts. But for her thinking and speaking at the right time the enterprise might have been delayed for half a century. It is to be

Digitized by Google

tunity than the new colony could give to educate her afterward ungrateful son.

The number of young men educated by the individual efforts of women cannot be estimated. T. W. Higginson, in the *Woman's Journal*, says:

The late President Walker once told me that, in his judgment, one-quarter of the young men in Harvard College were being carried through by the special self-denial and sacrifices of women. I cannot answer for the ratio, but I can testify to having been an instance of this, myself; and to having known a never-ending series of such cases of self-devotion.

Some of these men, educated by the labor and self-sacrifice of others, look down upon the social position in which their women friends are still forced to remain. The result to the recipient has often been of doubtful value, so far as the development of the affections is concerned. Sometimes the great obligation has been forgotten. Only in rare instances, to either party did the life-long sacrifice on the part of the women of the family become of permanent and spiritual value!

The average woman of forty years ago was very humble in her notions of the sphere of woman. What if she did hunger and thirst after knowledge? She could do nothing with it, even if she could get it. So she made a *fetich* of some male relative, and gave him the mental food for which she herself was starving, and devoted all her energies towards helping him to become what she felt, under better conditions, she herself might have been. It was enough in those early days to be the *mother* or

---

deplored that Lucy Downing established the unwise precedent of educating one member of the family at the expense of the rest; an example followed by too many women since her time. Harvard College itself has followed it as well, in that it has so long excluded from its privileges that portion of the human family to which Lucy Downing belonged.

Although women have never been permitted to become students of this college, or of any of the schools connected with it, yet they have always taken a great interest in its pecuniary welfare, and the University is largely indebted to the generosity of women for its endowment and support. From the records of Harvard College, it appears that funds have been contributed by 167 women, which amount, in the aggregate, to $325,000. Out of these funds a proportion of the university scholarships were founded, and at least one of its professors' chairs. In its Divinity school alone five of the ten scholarships bear the names of women. Caroline A. Plummer of Salem gave $15,000 to found the Plummer Professorship of Christian Morals. Sarah Derby bequeathed $1,000 towards founding the Hersey Professorship of Anatomy and Physic. The Holden Chapel was built with money given for that purpose by Mrs. Samuel Holden and her daughters. Anna E. P. Sever, in 1879, left a legacy to this college of $140,000. [See Harvard Roll of Honor for women in *Harvard Register* in 1880-81.] Other known benefactors of Harvard University are: Lady Moulson, Hannah Sewall, Mary Saltonstall, Dorothy Saltonstall, Joanna Alford, Mary P. Townsend, Ann Toppan, Eliza Farrar, Ann F. Schaeffer, Levina Hear, Rebecca A. Perkins, Caroline Merriam, Sarah Jackson, Hannah C. Andrews, Nancy Kendall, Charlotte Harris, Mary Osgood, Lucy Osgood, Sarah Winslow, Julia Bullock, Marian Hovey, Anna Richmond, Caroline Richmond, Clara J. Moore and Susan Cabot.—[H. H. R.

The question is often asked, why are women so much more desirous than men to see their children educated? Because it is a right that has been denied to themselves. To them education means liberty, wealth, position, power. When the black race at the South were emancipated, they were far more eager for education than the poor whites, and for the same reason.—[EDS.

sister of somebody. Women were almost as abject in this particular as the Thracian woman of old, who said:

> "I am not of the noble Grecian race,
> I'm poor Abrotonon, and born in Thrace;
> Let the Greek women scorn me, if they please,
> I was the mother of Themistocles."

There are women still left who believe their husbands, sons, or male friends can study, read and *vote* for them. They are like some frugal house-mothers, who think their is no need of a dinner if the good-man of the family is not coming home to share it. Just as if the man-half of the human family can "eat, learn and inwardly digest," to make either physical or mental strength for the other half!

Maria Mitchell of Massachusetts became Professor of Astronomy and Mathematics at Vassar, in 1866, the first woman in the country to hold such a position. Since that time women have become members of the faculty in several of the large colleges in the country.

In the early days of the commonwealth women practiced midwifery, and were very successful. Mrs. John Eliot, Anne Hutchinson, Mrs. Fuller and Sarah Alcock were the first in the State. Janet Alexander, a Scotchwoman, was a well-trained midwife.* She lived in Boston, and was always recognized as a good practitioner in her line by the leading doctors in that city. Dr. John C. Warren of Boston invited this lady to come to this country. His biography, recently published, contains a short record of the matter, in which he says: "We determined to recommend Mrs. Alexander. She was a Scotchwoman, regularly educated, and having Dr. Hamilton's diploma." Quite a storm was raised among the younger physicians of Boston by this attempted innovation, because they thought Dr. Warren was trying to deprive them of profitable practice. But Mrs. Alexander, supported by Dr. Warren, and perhaps other physicians, continued her occupation and educated her daughter in the same profession. Dr. Harriot K. Hunt practiced in Boston as early as 1835. She sought admission to the Harvard Medical School, and was many times refused. She was not what is called a "regular physician." In her day there existed no schools or colleges for the medical education of women, but she studied by herself,

* Ruth Barnaby, aged 101 in 1875, Elizabeth Phillips and Hannah Greenway were also members of this branch of the profession. The last was midwife to Mrs. Judge Sewall, who was the mother of nineteen children. Judge Samuel E. Sewall mentions this fact in his diary, recently published.

Digitized by Google

and acquired some knowledge of diseases peculiar to women. Her success was so great in her line of practice that she proved the need existing for physicians of her own sex.

Dr. Hunt's tussle with the medical faculty will long be remembered. She was the first woman in the State who dared assert her right to recognition in this profession. For this, and for her persistent efforts to secure for them a higher education, she deserves the gratitude of every woman who has since followed her footsteps into a profession over which the men had long held undisputed control. In 1853 the degree of M. D. was conferred on her by the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania. The first medical college for women, organized by Dr. Samuel Gregory of Boston, was chartered in 1856, under the name of the New England Female Medical College, and in 1874, by an act of the legislature, united with the Boston University School of Medicine. In 1868 it had graduated seventy-two women, among whom were Dr. Lucy E. Sewall and Dr. Helen Morton (who afterwards went to Paris and studied obstetrics at Madame Aillot's Hospital of Maternity) and Dr. Mercy B. Jackson.* There are now 205 regular practitioners in the State.

In 1863, Dr. Zakrzewska, in coöperation with Lucy Goddard and Ednah D. Cheney, established the New England Hospital for Women and Children. Its avowed objects were: (1) to provide women the medical aid of competent physicians of their own sex; (2) to assist educated women in the practical study of medicine; (3) to train nurses for the care of the sick. This was the first hospital in New England over which women have had entire control, both as physicians and surgeons. Boston University is open to both sexes, with equal studies, duties and privileges. This institution was incorporated in 1869, and includes, among other schools and colleges, schools of theology, law and medicine. The faculty consists of many distinguished men and women. Boston University School of Medicine (homeopathic) was organized in 1873. Of the thirty-two lecturers and professors who constitute the faculty, five are women. In 1884 the three highest of the four prizes for the best medical thesis were won by women. Of the 610 pupils in 1884, 155 were women; sixty of these were in the school of medicine. There are women in all departments, except agriculture and theology.

* Dr. Jackson had a large practice in Boston, and filled for five years the chair of professor of diseases of children in the Boston University School of Medicine.

Digitized by Google

They do not study theology because they cannot be ordained to preach in any of the leading churches.

The Massachusetts Medical Society in 1884, on motion of Dr. Henry I. Bowditch, voted to admit women to membership. Dr. Emma L. Call and Dr. Harriet L. Harrington were the first two women admitted. January 11, 1882, at the monthly meeting of Harvard overseers, the question of admitting women to the Medical School came before the board. An individual desiring to contribute a fund for the medical education of women in Harvard University asked the president and fellows whether such a fund would be accepted and used as designed. Majority and minority reports were submitted by the committee in charge, and after a long discussion it was voted, 11 to 6, to accept the fund, the income to be ultimately used for the medical education of women. At the April meeting, the Committee on the Medical Education of Women presented a report, which was adopted by a vote of 13 to 12:

> That, in the opinion of the board, it is not advisable for the University to hold out any encouragement that it will undertake the medical education of women.

The Harvard Divinity School at Cambridge sometimes admits women, but does not recognize them publicly, nor grant them degrees; but there are other theological schools in the State where a complete preparation for the ministerial profession can be obtained. The attitude of the churches toward women has changed greatly within thirty years. As early as 1869, women began to serve on committees, and to be ordained deaconesses of churches. They also hold important offices connected with the different church organizations. They serve on the boards of State and national religious associations. There are also missionary associations, both home and foreign, and Christian unions, all officered and managed exclusively by women. Even the treasurers of these large bodies are women, and their husbands or trustees are no longer required to give bonds for them.* At the general conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the word "male" was stricken from the discipline, and the word "person" inserted in its place, in all cases save those that concerned the ordination of clergy.

* In 1840, a Massachusetts woman could not legally be treasurer of even a sewing society without having some man responsible for her. In 1869, it was necessary that the subscriptions of a married woman for a newspaper or for charities should be in the name of her husband.

Digitized by Google

Olympia Brown was the first woman settled as pastor in the State. Her parish was at Weymouth Landing. In 1864 she petitioned the Massachusetts legislature "that marriages performed by a woman should be made legal." The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom the matter was referred, reported that no legislation was necessary, as marriages solemnized by women were already legal.* Thus the legislature of the State established the precedent, that "he" meant "she" under the law, in one instance at least. Phebe Hanaford, Mary H. Graves and Lorenza Haynes were the first Massachusetts women to be ordained preachers of the gospel. Rev. Lorenza Haynes has been chaplain of the Maine House of Representatives.

The three best-known women sculptors in this country were born and bred in Massachusetts. They are Harriet Hosmer, Margaret Foley and Anne Whitney. Harriet Hosmer was the first to free herself from the traditions of her sex and follow her profession as a sculptor. When she desired to fit herself for her vocation there was no art school east of the Mississippi river where she could study anatomy, or find suitable models. Margaret Foley, who, amid the hum of the machinery of the Lowell cotton mills, first conceived the idea of chiseling her thought on the surface of a "smooth-lipped shell," was obliged to go to Rome in order to get the necessary instruction in cameo-cutting. There her genius developed so much that she began to model in clay, and soon became a successful sculptor in marble. Lucy Larcom, in her "Idyl of Work," says of Miss Foley:

> "That broad-browed delicate girl will carve at Rome
> Faces in marble, classic as her own."

One of her finest creations is "The Fountain," first exhibited in Horticultural Hall at the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia, 1876. A free art-school was opened to women in Boston in 1867, and Anne Whitney was not obliged to go to Rome for instruction in the appliances of her art. Harriet Hosmer and Margaret Foley have both made statues which adorn the public buildings and parks of their native country; and Anne Whitney's statues of Samuel Adams and Harriet Martineau are the crowning works of her genius.

---

* Olympia Brown's own account of this transaction is as follows: In 1864, soon after my settlement in Weymouth, I solemnized a marriage. It was the first time a woman had officiated in this capacity, and there was so much talk about the legality of the act, that I petitioned the legislature to take such action as was necessary in order to make marriages solemnized by me legal. The committee to whom it was referred reported that no legislation was necessary.

Digitized by Google

No great work has yet been done by Massachusetts women in oil painting; but in water colors, and in decorative art, many have excelled, first prizes in superiority of design having been taken by them over their masculine competitors. Lizzie B. Humphrey, Jessie Curtis, Sarah W. Whitman and Fidelia Bridges, take high rank as artists. Helen M. Knowlton, a pupil of William M. Hunt, is a skillful artist in charcoal and has produced some fine pictures. Women form a large proportion of the students in the school of design recently opened in Boston. A great deal of the ornamental painting now so fashionable on cards and all fancy articles is done by the deft fingers of women. The census of 1880 reports 268 artists and 1,270 musicians and teachers of music.

Of woman as actress and public singer, it is unnecessary to speak, since she has the right of way in both these professions. Here, fortunately, the supply does not exceed the demand; consequently she has her full share of rights, and what is better, equitable pay for her labor. In 1880 there were 111 actresses. Charlotte Cushman, Clara Louise Kellogg and Annie Louise Cary were born in Massachusetts.

The drama speaks too feebly on the right side of the woman question. No successful modern dramatist has made this "humour" of the times the subject of his play. An effort was made in 1879, by the executive committee of the New England Association, to secure a woman suffrage play: but it was not successful, and there is yet to be written a counteractive to that popular burlesque, "The Spirit of '76." It is to be regretted that the stage still continues to ridicule the woman's rights movement and its leaders; for, as Hamlet says:

> "The play's the thing,
> Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king."

In 1650, when Anne Bradstreet lived and wrote her verses, a woman author was almost unknown in English literature. This lady was the wife of the governor of Massachusetts, and because of her literary tendencies was looked upon by the people of her time as a marvel of womankind. Her contemporaries called her the "tenth muse lately sprung up in America," and one of them, Rev. Nathaniel Ward, was inspired to write an address to her, in which he declares his wonder at her success as a poet, and playfully foretells the consequences if women are permitted to intrude farther into the domain of man. The closing lines express

Digitized by Google

so well the conflicting emotions which torment the minds of the opponents of the woman suffrage movement, that I venture to quote them:

> "Good sooth," quoth the old Don, "tell ye me so?
> I muse whither at length these Girls will go.
> It half revives my chil, frost-bitten blood
> To see a woman once do aught that's good.
> And, chode by Chaucer's Boots and Homer's Furrs,
> Let men look to't least Women wear the Spurrs."

In 1818, Hannah Mather Crocker, grand-daughter of Cotton Mather, published a book, called "Observations on the Rights of Women." In speaking of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mrs. Crocker says, that while that celebrated woman had a very independent mind, and her "Rights of Woman" is replete with fine sentiments, yet, she continues, patronizingly, "we do not coincide with her respecting the total independence of the sex." Mrs. Crocker evidently wanted her sex to be not too independent, but just independent enough.*

In 1841, when Lydia Maria Child edited the *Anti-Slavery Standard*, Margaret Fuller the *Dial*, and Harriot F. Curtis and Harriet Farley the *Lowell Offering*, there were perhaps in New England no other well-known women journalists or editors. Cornelia Walter of the *Evening Transcript* was the first woman journalist in Boston. To-day, women are editors and publishers of newspapers all over the United States; and the woman's column is a part of many leading newspapers. Sallie Joy White was the first regular reporter in Boston. She began on the *Boston Post*, a Democratic newspaper, in 1870. Her first work was to report the proceedings of a woman suffrage meeting. She is now on the staff of the *Boston Daily Advertiser*. Lilian Whiting is on the staff of the *Traveller*, and most of the other Boston newspapers have women among their editors and reporters. Some of the best magazine writing of the time is done by women; one needs but to look over the table of contents of the leading periodicals to see how large a proportion of the articles is written by them.

* This little book is worthy of mention, from the fact that it is probably the first publication of its kind in Massachusetts, if not in America. The whole title of the book is, "Observations on the Rights of Women, with their appropriate duties agreeable to Scripture, reason and common sense." Mrs. Crocker, in her introduction, says: "The wise author of Nature has endowed the female mind with equal powers and faculties, and given them the same right of judging and acting for themselves as he gave the male sex." She further argues that, "According to Scripture, woman was the first to transgress and thus forfeited her original right of equality, and for a time was under the yoke of bondage, till the birth of our blessed Savior, when she was restored to her equality with man."

This is a very fine beginning, and would seem to savor strongly of the modern woman's rights doctrine; but, unfortunately, the author, with charming inconsistency, goes on to say,—"We shall strictly adhere to the principle of the impropriety of females ever trespassing on masculine grounds, as it is morally incorrect, and physically impossible."

Digitized by Google

Really, the sex seems to have taken possession of what Carlyle called the "fourth estate"—the literary profession, and they journey into unexplored regions of thought to give the omniverous modern reader something new to feed upon. The census of 1880 reports 445 women as authors and literary persons.

The newspaper itself, that great engine "whose ambassadors are in every quarter of the globe, whose couriers upon every road," has slowly swung round, and is at last headed in the right direction. Reporters for the daily press in Massachusetts no longer write in a spirit of flippancy or contempt, and there is not an editor in the State of any account who would permit a member of his staff to report a woman's meeting in any other spirit than that of courtesy. Teachers occupying high positions and presidents of colleges have given pronounced opinions in favor of the reform. Said President Hopkins of Williams College, in 1875:

> I would at this point correct my teaching in "The Law of Love," to the effect that *home* is peculiarly the sphere of woman, and civil government that of man. I now regard the home as the joint sphere of man *and* woman, and the sphere of civil government more of an open question between the two.

The New England Women's Club, parent* of the modern clubs and associations for the advancement of women, has been one of the factors in the woman's rights movement. Its members have, in their work and in their lives, illustrated the doctrine of woman's equality with man. It was formed in February, 1868.†

There has never been, from time immemorial, much difference of opinion concerning woman's right to do a good share in the *drudgery* of the world. But in the remunerative employments, before 1850, she was but sparsely represented. In 1840, when

---

* In 1836 there was a small woman's club of Lowell factory operatives, officered and managed entirely by women. This may be a remote first cause of the origin of the New England Women's Club, since it bears the same relation to that flourishing institution, that the native crab does to the grafted tree. This was the first woman's club in the State, if not in the whole country.

† A few ladies met at the house of Dr. Harriot K. Hunt to consider a plan for organization. Its avowed object was "to supply the daily increasing need of a great central resting place, for the comfort and convenience of those who may wish to unite with us, and ultimately become a center for united and organized social thought and action." Its first president was Caroline M. Severance. On the executive board were the names of Julia Ward Howe, Ednah D. Cheney, Lucy Goddard, Harriet M. Pitnam, Jane Alexander, Abby W. May, and many others who have since become well known. This club held its first meetings in private houses, but it has for several years occupied spacious club rooms on Park street in Boston. Julia Ward Howe is its president. The club has its own historian, and when this official gives the result of her researches to the public, there will be seen how many projects for the elevation of women and the improvement of social life have had their inception in the brains of those who assemble in the parlors of the New England Woman's Club. In 1874, it projected the movement by which women were first elected on the school committee of Boston, and also prepared the petition to be sent to the Massachusetts legislature of 1879, the result of which was the passage of the law allowing women to vote for school committees. In the *Woman's Journal* for 1883 will be found a sketch of this club.

Digitized by Google

Harriet Martineau visited this country, she found to her surprise that there were only seven vocations, outside home, into which the women of the United States had entered. These were "teaching, needlework, keeping boarders, weaving, type-setting, and folding and stitching in book-bindery." In contrast, it is only necessary to mention that in Massachusetts alone, woman's ingenuity is now employed in nearly 300 different branches of industry. It cannot be added that for doing the same kind and amount of work women are paid men's wages. The census does not include the services of the mother and daughter among the *paid* vocations, though, as is well known, in many instances they do all the housework of the family. They get no wages, and therefore do not appear among the "useful classes." They are not earners, but savers of money. A money-*saver* is not a recognized factor, either in political economy or in the State census. The mother, daughter or wife is put down in its pages as "keeping house." If they were paid for their services they would be called "housekeepers," and would have their place among the paid employments.

Among the many rights woman has appropriated to herself must be included the "patent right." The charge has often been made that women never invent anything, but statistics on the subject declare that in 1880 patents for their own inventions were issued to eighty-seven different women in the United States. A fair proportion of these were from Massachusetts.

This progress in the various departments encountered great opposition from certain teachers and writers. Dr. Bushnell's "Reform Against Nature," Dr. Fulton's talk both in and out of the pulpit, served to show the weakness of that side of the question. Frances Parkman, Dr. Holland, Dr. W. H. Hammond, Rev. Morgan Dix, and even some women have added their so-called arguments in the vain attempt to keep woman as they think "God made her."

Much the stronger writers and speakers have been found on the right side of this question. The names of leading speakers, such as William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips and Theodore Parker, have already been mentioned. Perhaps the most suggestive articles in favor of the reform were T. W. Higginson's "Ought Women to Learn the Alphabet," published in the *Atlantic Monthly* of February, 1859, and Samuel Bowles' "The

Digitized by Google

Woman Question and Sex in Politics," published at a later date in the *Springfield Republican.* "Warrington," in his letters to the same newspaper, from 1868 to 1876, never failed to present a good and favorable argument on some phase of the woman question. Caroline Healey Dall's lectures before 1860, and her book "The College, the Market and the Court," published in 1868, were seed-grain sown in the field of this reform. Samuel E. Sewall's able digest of the laws relating to the legal condition of married women, and William I. Bowditch's admirable pamphlets,* have done incalculable service.

Of women in the civil service, there are: 58 clerks, 266 employés and 387 officials—total, 411. This includes postmasters and clerks in bureaus. In 1880, General F. A. Walker, superintendent of the census, instructed the supervisors of the several districts to appoint women as enumerators when practicable. They were accordingly so appointed in many parts of the United States. Carroll D. Wright, supervisor of the district of Massachusetts was in favor of General Walker's instructions, and out of the 903 enumerators appointed by him, thirty were women. This was an exceedingly large proportion compared with the number appointed in States where supervisors were not in favor of women enumerators.

Thanks to the efforts of Caroline Healey Dall, the American Social Science Association, formed in 1865, put women on its board of officers, as did the Boston Social Science Association, organized the same year. These were the first large organizations in the country to admit women on an absolute equality with men. The result of this action vindicated at once and forever woman's fitness to occupy positions of honor in associations that man had hitherto claimed for himself alone. This has encouraged women to express themselves in the presence of the wisest men, and enabled them to present to the public the woman side of some great questions. Women are officers as well as members of many societies originally established exclusively for men. A national society for political education, formed in 1880, of which women are members, has at least one woman on its board of officers. What would have been thought thirty years ago, if women had studied finance, banks and banking, money, currency, sociology and political science?

* "Taxation of Women in Massachusetts"; "Woman Suffrage a Right, not a Privilege," and "The Forgotten Woman in Massachusetts."

Digitized by Google

The Summer School of Philosophy at Concord was founded in 1879.* A majority of the students are women, as was not the case in the elder schools of philosophy, and they come from far and near to spend a few weeks of their summer vacation in the enjoyment of this halcyon season of rest. Day after day they sit patiently on the æsthetic benches of the Hillside chapel and bask in the calm light of mild philosophy. Its seed was sown forty years ago, in what was called the Transcendental movement in New England. The Concord school finds in Mr. Sanborn its executive spirit, without which it could no more have come into existence at this time than its first seed could have been planted forty years ago, without the conceptive thought of Mr. Emerson, Mr. Alcott and Margaret Fuller.

Boston University long ago offered the advantages of its law-school to women, but they do not much avail themselves of this privilege. Lelia J. Robinson, in March, 1881, made her application for admission to the bar. In presenting her claim before the court, April 23, Mr. Charles R. Train admitted that it was a novel one; but in a very effective manner he went on to state the cogent reasons why a woman who had carefully prepared herself for the profession of the law should be permitted to practice in the courts. At the close, Chief-Justice Gray gave the opinion, informally, that the laws, as they now exist, preclude woman from being attorney-at-law; but he reserved the matter for the consideration of the full bench. The Supreme Judicial Court rendered an adverse decision. Petitions were then sent to the legislature of 1882, and that body passed an act † declaring that, "The provisions of law relating to the qualification and admission to practice of attorneys-at-law shall apply to women." The petition of Lelia Josephine Robinson to the Supreme Court was as follows:

1. The best administration of justice may be most safely secured by allowing the representation of all classes of the people in courts of justice.

2. To allow women to practice at the bar as attorneys is only to secure to the people the right to select their own counsel. It is to give the women of Massachusetts the opportunity of consulting members of their own sex for that advice and assistance which none but authorized attorneys and counsellors are legally qualified to give.

3. To exclude women from the bar would be to do an injustice to the community, in preventing free and wholesome competition of existing talent, and to do still greater injustice to those women who are qualified for the profession, by shutting them out from an honorable and remunerative means of gaining a livelihood.

---

* Its projectors were A. Bronson Alcott, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Professor W. T. Harris, Frank B. Sanborn, Professor Benjamin Pierce, Dr. H. K. Jones, Elizabeth P. Peabody and Ednah D. Cheney.

† This act is almost as brief as a certain clause in one of the election laws of the State of Texas, which says: "The masculine gender shall include the feminine and neuter."

Digitized by Google

4. To exclude women from the bar because there are certain departments of the profession which are peculiarly ill-adapted to their sex and nature, would be to assume arbitrarily that, with entire lack of judgment or discretion, modesty or policy, they would seek or accept such business; and to close to them those avenues of the profession for which they are generally admitted to be eminently well adapted, for such a reason, and upon such an assumption, would be so grossly unjust that no argument can be based on such an impossible contingency.

Your applicant, having faithfully and diligently pursued the study of law for three years, being a graduate of the Boston University Law School, and having complied with the other requirements of the statute and the rules of court upon the subject, respectfully prays that her petition for examination, which was duly filed, may be favorably considered, and that it be included in the general notice to the Board of Examiners of Suffolk county. LELIA JOSEPHINE ROBINSON.

The opinion given by the Supreme Judicial Court, so far as it relates to the main point at issue, is as follows:

The question presented by this petition and by the report on which it has been reserved for our determination, is whether, under the laws of the commonwealth, an unmarried woman is entitled to be examined for admission as an attorney and counsellor of this Court. This being the first application of the kind in Massachusetts, the Court, desirous that it might be fully argued, informed the executive committee of the Bar Association of the city of Boston of the application, and has received elaborate briefs from the petitioner in support of her petition and from two gentlemen of the bar as *amici curiæ* in opposition thereto. The statute under which the application is made is as follows: "A citizen of this State, or an alien who has made the primary declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and who is an inhabitant of this State, at the age of twenty-one years and of good moral character, may, on the recommendation of an attorney, petition the Supreme Judicial or Superior Court to be examined for admission as an attorney, whereupon the Court shall assign a time and place for the examination, and if satisfied with his acquirements and qualifications he shall be admitted." St. 1876, c. 107.

The word "citizen," when used in its most common and most comprehensive sense, doubtless includes women; but a woman is not, by virtue of her citizenship, vested by the Constitution of the United States, or by the constitution of the commonwealth, with any absolute right, independent of legislation, to take part in the government, either as voter or as an officer, or to be admitted to practice as an attorney. *Minor vs. Happersett, 51 Wall. 162. Bradwell vs. Illinois, 16 Wall. 130.* The rule that "words importing the masculine gender may be applied to females," like all other general rules of construction of statutes, must yield when such construction would be either "repugnant to the context of the same statute," or "inconsistent with the manifest intent of the legislature." Gen. Sts. c. 3, § 7.

The only statute making any provisions concerning attorneys, that mentions women, is the poor-debtor act, which, after enumerating among the cases in which an arrest of the person may be made on execution in an action of contract, that in which "the debtor is attorney-at-law," who has unreasonably neglected to pay to his client money collected, enacts, in the next section but one, "that no woman shall be arrested on any civil process except for tort." Gen. Sts. c. 124, §§ 5, 7. If these provisions do not imply that the legislature assumed that women should not be attorneys, they certainly have no tendency to show that it intended that they should. The word "citizen," in the statute under which this application is made, is but a repetition of the word originally adopted with a view of excluding aliens, before the statute of 1852, c. 154, allowed those aliens to be admitted to the bar who had made the preliminary declaration of intention to become citizens. Rev. Sts., c. 88, § 19. Gen. Sts., c. 121, § 28.

The reënactment of the act relating to the admission of attorneys in the same words without more so far as relates to the personal qualifications of the applicant, since

Digitized by Google

other statutes have expressly modified the legal rights and capacity of women in other important respects, tends rather to refute than to advance the theory that the legislature intended that these words should comprehend women. No inference of an intention of the legislature to include women in the statutes concerning the admission of attorneys can be drawn from the mere omission of the word "male." The only statute to which we have referred, in which that word is inserted, is the statute concerning the qualifications of voters in town affairs, which, following the language of the article of the constitution that defines the qualifications of voters for governor, lieutenant-governor, senators and representatives, speaks of "every male citizen of twenty-one years of age," etc. Gen. Sts. c. 18, § 19. Const. Mass. Amendments, art. 3. Words which taken by themselves would be equally applicable to women and to men are constantly used in the constitution and statutes, in speaking of offices which it could not be contended, in the present state of law, that women were capable of holding.

The Courts of the commonwealth have not assumed by their rules to admit to the bar any class of persons not within the apparent intent of the legislature as manifested in the statutes. The word "persons," in the latest rule of Court upon the subject, was the word used in the rule of 1810 and in the statutes of 1785 and 1836, at times when no one contemplated the possibility of a woman's being admitted to practice as an attorney. 121 Mass. 600. 6. Mass. 382. St. 1785, c. 23. Rev. St. c. 18, 20. Gen. Sts. c. 121, § 29. The United States Court of Claims, at December term, 1873, on full consideration, denied an application of a woman to be admitted to practice as an attorney upon the ground "that under the constitution and laws of the United States a Court is without power to grant such an application, and that a woman is without legal capacity to take the office of an attorney." *Lockwood's Case, 9 Ct. of Claims, 346, 356.* At October terms 1876 of the Supreme Court of the United States, the same petitioner applied to be admitted to practice as an attorney and counsellor of that Court, and her application was denied.

The decision has not been officially reported, but upon the record of the Court, of which we have an authentic copy, it is thus stated: "Upon the presentation of this application, the chief-justice said that notice of this application having been previously brought to his attention, he had been instructed by the Court to announce the following decision upon it: By the uniform practice of the Court from its organization to the present time, and by the fair construction of its rules, none but men are permitted to practice before it as attorneys and counsellors. This is in accordance with immemorial usages in England, and the law and the practice in all the States until within a recent period, and the Court does not feel called upon to make a change until such change is required by statute or a more extended practice in the highest Courts of the States." The subsequent act of congress of February 15, 1879, enables only those women to be admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States who have been for three years members of the bar of the highest Court of a State or territory, or of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia.

The conclusion that women cannot be admitted to the bar under the existing statutes of the commonwealth is in accordance with judgments of the highest Courts of the States of Illinois and Wisconsin. *Bradwell's Case, 55 Ill., 525. Goodell's Case, 39 Wis., 232.* The suggestion in the brief of the petitioner that women have been admitted in other States can have no weight here, in the absence of all evidence that (except under clear affirmative words in a statute) they have ever been so admitted upon deliberate consideration of the question involved, or by a Court whose decisions are authoritative.

It is hardly necessary to add that our duty is limited to declaring the law as it is, and that whether any change in that law would be wise or expedient is a question for the legislative and not for the judicial department of the government.

Petition dismissed.

MARCUS MORTON, *Chief-Justice,*
WILLIAM E. ENDICOTT,
OTIS P. LORD,
WALBRIDGE A. FIELD.

[Signed:] CHARLES DEVENS,
WILLIAM ALLEN,
CHARLES ALLEN.

Digitized by Google

The three preceding decisions of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts against the rights of the women of the commonwealth were as follows:

The first decision was in the case of Sarah E. Wall of Worcester, who had refused to pay her taxes under the following protest:

Believing with the immortal Declaration of Independence that taxation and representation are inseparable; believing that the constitution of the State furnishes no authority for the taxation of woman; believing also that the constitution of the higher law of God, written on the human soul, requires us, if we would be worthy the rich inheritance of the past and true to ourselves and the future, to yield obedience to no statute that shall tend to fetter its aspirations, I shall henceforth pay no taxes until the word *male* is stricken from the voting clauses of the constitution of Massachusetts.

Worcester *Daily Spy*, October 5, 1858. SARAH E. WALL.

Miss Wall was prosecuted by the city collector, and she carried her case before the Supreme Court, where she appeared for herself, W. A. Williams appearing for the collector. In an account of this matter in 1881, Miss Wall says: "Although it was in 1858 that my resistance to taxation commenced, it was not until 1863 that the contest terminated and the decision was rendered. I think the Supreme Court would always find some way to evade a decision on this question."

Wheeler vs. Wall, 6 Allen, 558: By the constitution of Massachusetts, c. 1, § 1, article 4, the legislature has power to impose taxes upon all the inhabitants of and persons resident, and estates lying within the said commonwealth. By the laws passed by the legislature in pursuance of this power and authority, the defendant is liable to taxation, although she is not qualified to vote for the officers by whom the taxes were assessed. The Court, acting under the constitution, and bound to support it and maintain its provisions faithfully, cannot declare null and void a statute which has been passed by the legislature, in pursuance of an express authority conferred by the constitution.—[Opinion by the chief-justice, George Tyler Bigelow.

The second decision on the will of Francis Jackson is copied *verbatim* from *Allen's Reports:*

Jackson vs. Phillips and others, 14 Allen, 539: A bequest to trustees, to be expended at their discretion, * * * * "to secure the passage of laws granting whether women, married or unmarried, the right to vote, to hold office, to hold, manage and devise property, and all other civil rights enjoyed by men," is not a charity.

Bill in equity by the executor of the will of Francis Jackson of Boston, for instructions as to the validity and effect of the following bequests and devises:

Art. 6th. "I give and bequeath to Wendell Phillips of said Boston, Lucy Stone, formerly of Brookfield, Mass., now the wife of Henry Blackwell of New York, and Susan B. Anthony of Rochester, N. Y., their successors and assigns, $5,000, not for their own use, but in trust, nevertheless, to be expended by them without any responsibility to any one, at their discretion, in such sums, at such times and in such places as they may deem fit, to secure the passage of laws granting women, whether married or unmarried, the right to vote, to hold office, to hold, manage and devise property, and all other civil rights enjoyed by men; and for the preparation and circulation of books, the delivery of lectures, and such other means as they may judge best; and I hereby constitute them a board of trustees for that intent and purpose, with power to add two other persons to said board if they deem it expedient. And I hereby appoint

Digitized by Google

Wendell Phillips president and treasurer, and Susan B. Anthony secretary of said board. I direct the treasurer of said board not to loan any part of said bequest, but to invest, and, if need be, sell and reïnvest the same in bank or railroad shares, at his discretion. I further authorize and request said board of trustees, the survivor and survivors of them, to fill any and all vacancies that may occur from time to time by death or resignation of any member or any officer of said board. One other bequest, hereinafter made, will, sooner or later, revert to this board of trustees. My desire is that they may become a permanent organization, until the rights of women shall be established equal with those of men; and I hope and trust that said board will receive the services and sympathy, the donations and bequests, of the friends of human rights. And being desirous that said board should have the immediate benefit of said bequest, without waiting for my exit, I have already paid it in advance and in full to said Phillips, the treasurer of said board, whose receipt therefor is on my files."

OPINION.—Gray, J. IV. It is quite clear that the bequest in trust to be expended "to secure the passage of laws granting women, whether married or unmarried, the right to vote, to hold office, to hold, manage and devise property, and all other civil rights enjoyed by men," cannot be sustained as a charity. No precedent has been cited in its support. This bequest differs from the others, in aiming directly and exclusively to change the laws; and its object cannot be accomplished without changing the constitution also. Whether such an alteration of the existing laws and frame of government would be wise and desirable, is a question upon which we cannot, sitting in a judicial capacity, properly express any opinion. Our duty is limited to expounding the laws as they stand. And those laws do not recognize the purpose of overthrowing or changing them, in whole or in part, as a charitable use. This bequest, therefore, not being for a charitable purpose, nor for the benefit of any particular persons, and being unrestricted in point of time, is inoperative and void. For the same reason, the gift to the same object, of one-third of the residue of the testator's estate after the death of his daughter, Mrs. Eddy, and her daughter, Mrs. Bacon, is also invalid, and will go to his heirs-at-law as a resulting trust.

Decision third was on the right of women to hold judicial offices. To quote again from *Allen's Reports:*

On June 8, 1871, the following order was passed by the governor and council, and on June 10 transmitted to the Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court, who, on June 29, returned the reply which is annexed. *Ordered*, That the opinion of the Supreme Judicial Court be requested as to the following questions: *First*—Under the constitution of this commonwealth, can a woman, if duly appointed and qualified as a justice of the peace, legally perform all acts appertaining to that office? *Second*—Under the laws of this commonwealth, would oaths and acknowledgments of deeds, taken before a married or unmarried woman duly appointed and qualified as a justice of the peace, be legal and valid?

OPINION.—By the constitution of the commonwealth, the office of justice of the peace is a judicial office, and must be exercised by the officer in person, and a woman, whether married or unmarried, cannot be appointed to such an office. The law of Massachusetts at the time of the adoption of the constitution, the whole frame and purport of the instrument itself, and the universal understanding and unbroken practical construction for the greater part of a century afterwards, all support this conclusion, and are inconsistent with any other. It follows that, if a woman should be formally appointed and commissioned as a justice of the peace, she would have no constitutional or legal authority to exercise any of the functions appertaining to that office. Each of the questions proposed must, therefore, be respectfully answered in the negative.

[Signed:] REUBEN A. CHAPMAN, HORACE GRAY, JR., JOHN WELLS, JAMES D. COLT, SETH AMES, MARCUS MORTON.

Boston, June 29, 1871.

Digitized by Google

It is to be remarked that the clause on which the court determined its judgment was of no practical consequence, since the money devised had already been paid to Wendell Phillips, who had disposed of it as the bequest required, and he had given his receipt to the testator for the amount.

Even the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts has begun to understand the trend of the woman's rights movement, and has rendered its first favorable decision, in the famous Eddy-will case. Wendell Phillips told me that he drew up this will, and that its provisions were so carefully worded that even the Supreme Court could find no flaw in it. It is in his own handwriting, and Chandler R. Ransom was the executor. Eliza F. Eddy was the daughter of Francis Jackson, and just before her death in 1882, desiring to help the suffrage cause and thus carry out her father's intentions, she made her will in which she bequeathed $40,000 for this purpose. The clause relating to this bequest is as follows:

Whatever is left, after paying the above legacies, I direct shall be divided into equal portions. One of said portions I leave to Susan B. Anthony of Rochester. N. Y.; and the other portion I leave to Lucy Stone, wife of Henry B. Blackwell, as her own absolute separate property, free from any control by him. I request said Susan and Lucy to use said fund thus given to further what is called the "Woman's Rights' Cause"; but neither of them is under any legal responsibility to any one or any court to do so.

Her will was filed and the Probate Court declared its validity. This decision was appealed from for several unimportant reasons by relatives of Mrs. Eddy, Francis W. and Jerome A. Bacon, minors; and the case was carried to the Supreme Judicial Court. After many delays it was finally decided in favor of the validity of the will, March, 1885, R. M. Morse, jr., and S. J. Elder for the plaintiff, and B. F. Butler and F. L. Washburn for the defendants. The court's final decision, rendered by Hon. Charles Devens, is as follows:

ALBERT F. BACON and others, executors and others *vs.* CHANDLER R. RANSOM, executor, and others.

Suffolk. March 18, 19, 1885. W. ALLEN, COLBURN and HOLMES, *Js.*, absent.

After a bequest in trust to A. and B., to be by them expended in securing the passage of laws granting women the right to vote, had been decreed void as not being a charity, a daughter of the testator bequeathed the residue of her estate (being about the amount she had received from her father's estate) to A. and B. "as their absolute property"; and added: "I request said A. and B. to use said fund thus given to further what is called the Woman's Rights Cause. But neither of them is under any legal responsibility to any one or any court to do so." *Held*, that the bequest was valid, and did not create a trust.

Digitized by Google

Bill in equity by the executors of the will of Lizzie F. Bacon, and certain legatees thereunder, against the executor of the will of Eliza F. Eddy, Lucy Stone, wife of H. B. Blackwell, Susan B. Anthony, and other legatees thereunder, and the attorney-general, to compel the executor of said Eddy's will to pay over to the plaintiffs the residue of her estate. The bill alleged the following facts:

Francis Jackson, the father of said Eliza F. Eddy, died in 1861, leaving a will, by the sixth article of which he gave $5,000 to Wendell Phillips, Lucy Stone Blackwell and Susan B. Anthony, in trust, "to be expended by them without any responsibility to any one, at their discretion, in such sums, at such times, and in such places as they may deem fit, to secure the passage of laws granting women, whether married or unmarried, the right to vote, to hold office, to hold, manage and devise property, and all other civil rights enjoyed by men; and for the preparation and circulation of books, the delivery of lectures, and such other means as they may judge best." By the eighth article he gave one-third of the residue to a trustee, to pay the income to his daughter, Eliza F. Eddy, during her life, and upon her death one-half of the income to the trustees and on the trusts named in the sixth article, and the other half to Mrs. Eddy's daughter, Mrs. Lizzie F. Bacon, during her life, and, on the death of Mrs. Bacon, the principal to the trustees and on the trusts named in the sixth article.

It was held by this court that these bequests were not a charity (see *Jackson vs. Phillips, 14 Allen, 539*).

In consequence of this decision, certain agreements, releases, and a partition were made, by which one-third of the residue of Mr. Jackson's estate became the property of Mrs. Eddy, subject to being held in trust for herself for life, and thereafter, as to one-half, for her daughter, Mrs. Bacon, during her life. Mrs. Eddy died December 29, 1881, leaving a will by which she gave absolute legacies to the amount of $24,500 to various persons therein named. This disposed of all her estate except what came to her from her father's estate. Her will then provided as follows:

"What is left, after paying the above legacies, I direct shall be divided into two equal portions; one of said portions I leave to Miss Susan B. Anthony of Rochester, in the State of New York, as her absolute property, and the other portion I leave to Lucy Stone, wife of H. B. Blackwell, as her own absolute and separate property, free from any control of him. I request said Susan and Lucy to use said fund thus given to further what is called the woman's rights cause; but neither of them is under any legal responsibility to any one or any court to do so."

The will further alleged that this residue was substantially the estate received from Francis Jackson; that the will was intended by the testatrix to defeat the decision of this court, before mentioned; that the testatrix had no personal acquaintance with Lucy Stone or Susan B. Anthony; that said gift was intended as a gift *in perpetuam* to the said cause, and was, without limit of time, upon trust in favor of said cause; and that said cause was not a charity within the meaning of the law, and was null and void.

Digitized by Google

The defendants demurred to the bill for want of equity. The case was heard by C. Allen, *J.*, on the bill and demurrer, and a decree was entered sustaining the demurrer and dismissing the bill. The plaintiffs appealed to the full court.

R. M. MORSE, Jr., and S. J. ELDER, for the plaintiffs.

B. F. BUTLER and F. L. WASHBURN, for the defendants.

Judge CHARLES DEVENS. The fact that the respective portions of the estate bequeathed by Mrs. Eddy to Mrs. Stone and Miss Anthony were in amount equal to or precisely the same as those which came to her by descent from her father, Francis Jackson, is not of importance in the case at bar. It had been held in *Jackson vs. Phillips, 14 Allen, 539*, that a certain bequest made by Mr. Jackson in trust was not, legally speaking, a public charity, and that it could not therefore pass to the beneficiaries named in his will. The property which he thus attempted to bequeath descended therefore to his legal representatives, of whom Mrs. Eddy was one. She received it with the same right to deal with it or dispose of it in her lifetime, or by will at her decease, that she had in any other estate which was her lawful property.

The bill alleges "that said will was intended by the testatrix to defeat the decision of the court, before mentioned; that the testatrix had no personal acquaintance with Lucy Stone or Susan B. Anthony; that said gift was intended as a gift *in perpetuam* to the said cause." But if Mrs. Eddy has complied with the rules of law in the disposition of her property, even if she has hoped thereby to attain the same object as that desired by her father, the decision referred to is not defeated, but is recognized and conformed to; and, whatever her intention may have been, her bequest is to be upheld.

Her gift to her beneficiaries is absolute in terms. They may do what they will with the property bequeathed to them, as they may with any other property which is lawfully their own. It is true that the gift is accompanied by a request that they will use the fund bequeathed "to further what is called the woman's rights cause." A request made by one who has the right to direct is often, perhaps generally, interpreted as a command. For this reason, recommendatory or precatory words used in a bequest are frequently treated as an express direction. Thus, if a legacy were given to A., with a request that out of the sum bequeathed he would pay to another a certain sum, or a portion thereof, it might well be construed as a legacy, to the amount named, to such person. The expression of the desire of the testator would be the expression of his will, and the words in form recommendatory would be held to be mandatory and imperative. Where such words are used, it is therefore a question of the fair construction to be attributed to them (*Whipple vs. Adams, 1 Met., 444; Warner vs. Bates, 98 Mass., 274; Spooner vs. Lovejoy, 108 Mass., 529*).

But the testatrix in the case at bar has left nothing to construction. Apparently aware that a request, where she had a right to direct, might be treated as a command, and desirous to make it entirely clear that no restraint or duty in any legal sense was imposed upon her legatees, and that the request of the will was such in the limited sense of the word

Digitized by Google

only, and in no respect mandatory, she adds thereto, referring to the legatees, "But neither of them is under any legal responsibility to any one or to any court to do so." Each of the legatees is therefore the sole judge of whether she will follow, or how far or in what way she will follow, the suggestion of the testatrix in the disposition of the estate absolutely bequeathed to her. It is a matter in which she is to be guided only by her judgment and conscience, and no trust is imposed upon the property she receives.

As no trust is created, it would be superfluous to consider whether, if the request of the testatrix were treated as a command, one would then be indicated capable of enforcement according to the rules of law.

Bill dismissed. [Signed:] MARCUS MORTON, *Chief-Justice.*
WALBRIDGE ABNER FIELD, CHARLES DEVENS,
WILLIAM ALLEN, CHARLES ALLEN,
WALDO COBURN, OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, Jr.

From these decisions our daughters should learn the importance of having some knowledge of law. Had not Mrs. Eddy learned from experience in her father's case that property could not be left in trust to any societies except those called religious and charitable, and made her bequest absolutely to persons, the gift of $56,000 would have been lost to the woman suffrage movement. As it was, nearly $10,000 was swallowed up in litigation to secure what the donees did finally obtain. Considering that Mrs. Eddy * is the only woman who has ever had both the desire and the power to make a large bequest to this cause, its friends have great reason to rejoice in her wisdom as well as her generosity.

Civilization would have been immeasurably farther advanced than it now is, had the many rich women, who have left large bequests to churches, and colleges for boys, concentrated their wealth and influence on the education, elevation and enfranchisement of their own sex. We trust that Mrs. Eddy's example may not be lost on the coming generation of women.—[EDITORS.

* We deeply regret that we have been unable to procure a good photograph of our generous benefactor, as it was our intention to make her engraving the frontispiece of this volume, and thus give the honored place to her through whose liberality we have been enabled at last to complete this work. We are happy to state that Mrs. Eddy's will was not contested by any of the descendents of the noble Francis Jackson, but by Jerome Bacon, a millionaire, the widower of her eldest daughter who survived the mother but one week. When the suit was entered the daughters of Mrs. Eddy, Sarah and Amy, her only surviving children, in a letter to the executor of the estate, Hon. C. R. Ransom, said: "We hereby consent and agree that, in case this suit now pending in the court shall be decided against the claims of Lucy Stone and Susan B. Anthony, we will give to them the net amount of any sum that as heirs may be awarded to us, in accordance with our mother's will."

CHAPTER XXXII.

CONNECTICUT.

Prudence Crandall—Eloquent Reformers—Petitions for Suffrage—The Committee's Report—Frances Ellen Burr—Isabella Beecher Hooker's Reminiscences—Anna Dickinson in the Republican Campaign—State Society Formed, October 28, 29, 1869—Enthusiastic Convention in Hartford—Governor Marshall Jewell—He Recommends More Liberal Laws for Women—Society Formed in New Haven, 1871—Governor Hubbard's Inaugural, 1877—Samuel Bowles of the *Springfield Republican*—Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford, Chaplain, 1870—John Hooker, esq., Champions the Suffrage Movement.

WHILE Connecticut has always been celebrated for its puritanical theology, political conservatism and rigid social customs, it was nevertheless the scene of some of the most hotly contested of the anti-slavery battles. While its leading clergymen and statesmen stoutly maintained the letter of the old creeds and constitutions, the Burleighs, the Mays, and the Crandalls strove to illustrate the true spirit of religion and republicanism in their daily lives by "remembering those that were in bonds as bound with them."

The example of one glorious woman like Prudence Crandall,* who suffered shameful persecutions in establishing a school for colored girls at Canterbury, in 1833, should have been sufficient to rouse every woman in Connecticut to some thought on the basic principles of the government and religion of the country. Yet we have no record of any woman in that State publicly sustaining her in that grand enterprise, though no doubt her heroism gave fresh inspiration to the sermons of Samuel J. May, then preaching in the village of Brooklyn, and the speeches and poems of the two eloquent reformers, Charles C. and William H. Burleigh. The words and deeds of these and other great souls, though seeming to slumber for many years, gave birth at last to new demands for another class of outraged citizens. Thus liberty is ever born of the hateful spirit of persecution. One question of reform settled forever by the civil war, the initiative for the next was soon

* The life of William Lloyd Garrison, Vol. I.: The Century Company, New York.

Digitized by Google

taken. In *The Revolution* of January 16, 1868, we find the following well-considered report on woman's enfranchisement, presented by a minority of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments to the legislature of Connecticut at its session of 1867:

The undersigned members of the committee believe that the prayer of the petitioners ought to be granted. It would be much easier for us to reject the petition and silently to acquiesce in the opinions of the majority upon the subject to which it relates, but our attention was challenged and an investigation invited by the bold axioms upon which the cause of suffrage for woman was claimed to rest, and the more we have examined the subject the more convinced we have become that the logic of our institutions requires a concession of that right. It is claimed by some that the right to vote is not a natural right, but that it is a privilege which some have acquired, and which may be granted to others at the option of the fortunate holders. But they fail to inform us how the possessors first acquired the privilege, and especially how they acquired the rightful power to withhold that privilege from others, according to caprice or notions of expediency. We hold this doctrine to be pernicious in tendency, and hostile to the spirit of a republican government; and we believe that it can only be justified by the same arguments that are used to justify slavery or monarchy—for it is an obvious deduction of logic that if one thousand persons have a right to govern another thousand without their consent, one man has a right to govern all.

Mr. Lincoln tersely said, "If slavery is not wrong nothing is wrong." So it seems to us that if the right to vote is not a natural right, there is no such thing as a natural right in human relations. The right to freedom and the right to a ballot both spring from the same source. The right to vote is only the right to a legitimate use of freedom. It is plain that if a man is not free to govern himself, and to have a voice in the taxation of his own property, he is not really free in any enlightened sense. Even Edward I. of England said, "It is a most equitable rule that what concerns all should be approved by all." This must rightfully apply to women the same as to men. And Locke, in his essay on civil government, said, "Nothing is more evident than that creatures of the same species and rank, promiscuously born to the same advantages of nature, and the use of the same faculties, should also be equal, one with another, without subordination or subjection." Talleyrand said, as an argument for monarchy, "The moment we reject an absolutely universal suffrage, we admit the principle of aristocracy." The founders of this nation asserted with great emphasis and every variety of repetition, the essential equality of human rights as a self-evident truth. The war of the Revolution was justified by the maxim, "Taxation without representation is tyranny"; and all republics vindicate their existence by the claim that "Governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed." Yet woman, in Connecticut, is governed without her consent, and taxed without representation.

Lord Camden, one of England's ablest jurists, long ago declared, "My position is this—taxation and representation are inseparable. The position is founded in a law of nature—nay more, it is itself an eternal law of nature." Our forefathers held to this principle, and fought seven years to establish it. They maintained their favorite theory of government against immense odds, and transmitted to their posterity the great work of putting it logically into practice. It is acknowledged by this legislature that "taxation without representation is tyranny," and that "governments derive their just power from the consent of the governed." If these phrases are anything more than the meaningless utterances of demagogues, anything more than the hypocritical apologies of rebellious colonies in a strait—then we submit that a *primâ facie* case for woman's right to vote has already been made out. To declare that a voice in the government is the right of all, and then give it to less than half, and that to the frac-

Digitized by Google

tion to which the theorist himself happens to belong, is to renounce even the appearance of principle.

It is plain to your committee that neither the State nor the nation can have peace on this suffrage question until some fair standard shall be adopted which is not based on religion, or color, or sex, or any accident of birth—a test which shall be applicable to every adult human being. In a republic the ballot belongs to every intelligent adult person who is innocent of crime. There is an obvious and sufficient reason for excluding minors, state-prison convicts, imbeciles and insane persons, but does the public safety require that we shall place the women of Connecticut with infants, criminals, idiots and lunatics? Do they deserve the classification? It seems to your committee that to enfranchise woman—or rather to cease to deprive her of the ballot, which is of right hers, would be reciprocally beneficial. We believe that it would elevate the character of our office-holders; that it would purify our politics; that it would render our laws more equitable; that it would give to woman a protection against half the perils which now beset her; that it would put into her hands a key that would unlock the door of every respectable occupation and profession; that it would insure a reconstruction of our statute laws on a basis of justice, so that a woman should have a right to her own children, and a right to receive and enjoy the proceeds of her own labor. John Neal estimates that the ballot is worth fifty cents a day to every American laborer, enabling each man to command that much higher wages. Does not gentlemanly courtesy, as well as equal justice, require that that weapon of defense shall be given to those thousands of working women among us who are going down to prostitution through three or four half-paid, over-crowded occupations?

It is said that woman is now represented by her husband, when she has one; but what is this representation worth when in Connecticut, two years ago, all of the married woman's personal property became absolutely her husband's, including even her bridal presents, to sell or give away, as he saw fit—a statute which still prevails in most of the States? What is that representation worth when even now, in this State, no married woman has the right to the use of her own property, and no woman, even a widow, is the natural guardian of her own children? Even in Connecticut, under man's representation, a widow whose husband dies without a will is regarded by law as an encumbrance on the estate which she, through years of drudgery, has helped to acquire. She can inherit none of the houses or land, but has merely the use of one-third, while the balance goes to his relatives—rich, perhaps, and persons whom she never saw. Does not this suggest reasons why woman should wish to represent herself?

It is said that women do not desire the ballot. This is by no means certain. It can be ascertained only by taking a vote. It is not proved by the fact that they have not yet generally clamored for the right, nor by the fact that some protest against it. In Persia, it is a law of society that virtuous women shall appear in public with their faces covered, and instead of murmuring at the restraint, they are universal in upholding it, and wonder at the immodesty and effrontery of English women who appear upon the streets unveiled. Custom hardens us to any kind of degradation. When woman was not admitted to the dinner-table as an equal with man, she undoubtedly thought the exclusion was perfectly proper, and quite in the nature of things, and the dinner-table became vile and obscene. When she was forbidden to enter the church, she approved the arrangement, and the church became a scene of hilarity and bacchanalian revel. When she was forbidden to take part in literature, she thought it was not her sphere, and disdained the alphabet, and the consequence was that literature became unspeakably impure, so that no man can now read in public some of the books that were written before woman brought chastity and refinement into letters. The Asiatics are probably not in favor of political liberty, or the American Indians in favor of civilization; but that does not prove that these would be bad for them, especially if thousands of the most enlightened did desire and demand the change. It is assumed that women are not in favor of this right; how can this be better ascertained than by submitting to them the question to vote upon—"yes" or "no."

Digitized by Google

If this legislature shall be averse to trusting woman to give her opinion even on the question of her own enfranchisement, we recommend that an amendment, striking the word "male" from the State constitution, be submitted to the qualified electors of the State. Can there be any possible danger in trusting those who have trusted us? They, not we, are the law-makers. An assembly is elected only because it would be inconvenient for all the citizens to vote upon every statute. But when any change in the fundamental law is seriously asked, it should be remitted to the people without hesitation, especially when that proposed change will render our logic consistent, and our institutions harmonious; when it will enforce the democratic doctrine that, in society, every human being has a right to do anything that does not interfere with the rights of others, and when it will establish equality in place of partiality, and vindicate the principle of All Rights for All. We therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution: [Here follows a resolution submitting to the people an amendment of the constitution giving women the right to vote equally with men.]

The members of the committee who signed this early declaration in favor of the rights of women should be remembered with honor. They are Henry Ashley, William Steele and J. D. Gallup, jr. The resolution recommended received 93 votes in the House of Representatives, against 111 in opposition. So strong an expression in favor of it at that time is a noteworthy fact in the history of the cause.

The petitions that called out this able report were secured through the influence of Frances Ellen Burr, who may be said to have been the pioneer of woman suffrage in Connecticut. She had made several attempts, through conversations with influential friends, to organize a State society many years before. From the inauguration of the State association until the present time Miss Burr has been one of its most efficient members, and has done more to popularize the question of woman suffrage throughout the State than any other person. Her accomplishments as a writer and speaker, as a reporter and stenographer, as well as her connection with the *Hartford Times* (a journal that has a very large circulation in the State), edited by her brother, have qualified her for wide and efficient influence. Her niece, Mrs. Ella Burr McManus, edits a column in that paper, under the head of "Social Notes." She is also an advocate of suffrage for women, and makes telling points, from week to week, on this question. In issuing the first numbers of *The Revolution*, the earliest words of good cheer came from Frances Ellen Burr.*

The general rebellion among women against the old conditions of society and the popular opinions as to their nature and destiny, has been organized in each State in this Union by the

* She was soon followed by Mrs. Middlebrook and Mrs. Lucy R. Elms, with warm benedictions. The latter called some meetings in her neighborhood in the autumn of 1868, and entertained us most hospitably at her beautiful home.

Digitized by Google

sudden awakening of some self-reliant woman, in whose soul had long slumbered new ideas as to her rights and duties, growing out of personal experiences or the distant echoes of onward steps in other localities. In Connecticut this woman was Isabella Beecher Hooker, who had scarcely dared to think, and much less to give shape in words, to the thoughts that, like unwelcome ghosts, had haunted her hours of solitude from year to year. Elizabeth Barrett Browning describes a hero as one who does what others do but say; who says what others do but think; and thinks what others do but dream. The successive steps by which Mrs. Hooker's dreams at last took shape in thoughts, words and actions, and brought her to the woman suffrage platform, are well told by herself:

My mind had long been disturbed with the tangled problem of social life, but it involved so many momentous questions that I could not see where to begin nor what to do. I could only protest in my heart, and leave the whole matter for God * to deal with in his wisdom. Thus matters stood until the year 1861, when Anna Dickinson, then a girl of nineteen, came to Hartford to speak in behalf of the Republican party, particularly on its hostility to the extension of slavery. I shall never forget the dismay—I know not what else to call it—which I felt at the announcement of her first speech in one of our public halls, lest harm should come to the political cause that enlisted my sympathies, and anxiety about the speaker, who would have to encounter so much adverse criticism in our conservative and prejudiced city. It was certainly a most startling occurrence, that here in my very home, where there had been hardly a lisp in favor of the rights of women, this girl should speak on political subjects, and that, too, upon the invitation of the leaders of a great political party. Here was a stride, not a mere step; and a stride almost to final victory for the suppressed rights of women.

My husband and I, full of anxiety and apprehension, but full, too, of determination to stand by one who so bravely shook off her trammels, went to hear this new Joan of Arc, and in a few minutes after she began we found ourselves, with the rest of the large audience, entranced by her eloquence. At the close of the meeting we went with many others to be introduced and give her the right hand of fellowship. She came home with us for the night, and after the family retired she and I communed together, heart to heart, as mother and daughter, and from this sweet, grand soul, born to the freedom denied to all women except those known as Quakers, I learned to trust as never before the teachings of the inner light, and to know whence came to them the recognition of equal rights with their brethren in the public assembly.

It was she who brought me to the knowledge of Mrs. John Stuart Mill, and her remarkable paper on "The Enfranchisement of Women," in *The*

* Those who leave the tangled problem of life to God for solution find, sooner or later, that God leaves it to them to settle in their own way.—[E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

Westminster Review. She told me, too, of Susan B. Anthony, a fearless defender of true liberty and woman's right of public speech; but I allowed an old and ignorant prejudice against her and Mrs. Stanton to remain until the year 1864, when, going South to nurse a young soldier who was wounded in the war, I met Mrs. Caroline Severance from Boston, who was residing in South Carolina, where her husband was in the service of the government, who confirmed what Miss Dickinson had told me of Miss Anthony, and unfolded to me the whole philosophy of the woman suffrage movement.

She afterwards invited me to her home near Boston, where I joined Mr. Garrison and others in issuing a call for a convention, which I attended, and aided in the formation of the New England Woman Suffrage Association. At this meeting, which I will not attempt to describe, I met Paulina Wright Davis, whose mere presence upon the platform, with her beautiful white hair and her remarkable dignity and elegance, was a most potent argument in favor of woman's participation in public affairs. I sought an introduction to her, and confessing my prejudice against Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony, whom I had never yet seen, she urged me to meet them as guests at her home in Providence; and a few weeks later, under the grand old trees of her husband's almost ducal estate, we went over the whole subject of man's supremacy and woman's subjection that had lain so many years a burden upon my heart, and, sitting at their feet, I said: "While I have been mourning in secret over the degradation of woman, you have been working, through opposition and obloquy, to raise her to self-respect and self-protection through enfranchisement, knowing that with equal political rights come equal social and industrial opportunities. Henceforth, I will at least share your work and your obloquy."

In September, 1869, just one year from that time, after spending several weeks in correspondence with friends all over the State, and making careful preliminary arrangements, I issued a call for the first woman suffrage convention that was ever held in Connecticut, at which a State society was formed. To my surprise and satisfaction, the city press each day devoted several columns to reports of our proceedings, and the enthusiasm manifested by the large audiences was as unexpected as it was gratifying. The speakers were worthy of the reception given them, and few occasions have gathered upon one platform so notable an assemblage of men and women.* The resolutions which formed the basis of the discussions were prepared and presented by Mr. Hooker:

Resolved, That there is no consideration whatever that makes the right of suffrage valuable to men, or that makes it the duty or the interest of the nation to concede it to men, that does not make it valuable to women, and the duty and interest of the nation to concede it to women.

Resolved, That the ballot will bring to woman a higher education, larger industrial opportunities, a wider field for thought and action, a sense of responsibility in her re-

* Among them were Paulina Wright Davis, Dr. Clemence Lozier, Mary A. Livermore, Julia Ward Howe, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Celia Burleigh, Caroline M. Severance, Rev. Olympia Brown, Frances Ellen Burr, Charlotte B. Wilbour, William Lloyd Garrison, Henry Ward Beecher, Nathaniel I. Burton, John Hooker, the Hutchinsons, with Sister Abby and her husband, Ludlow Patton.

lations to the public welfare, and, in place of mere complaisance and flattery, the higher and truer respect of men.

Resolved, That political affairs, involving nearly all those questions that relate to the welfare of the nation and the progress of society towards a perfect Christian civilization, ought to interest deeply every intelligent mind and every patriotic heart; and, while women love their country and the cause of Christian progress no less than men, they ought to have the same opportunity with men to exert a political power in their behalf.

Resolved, That in the alarming prevalence of public dishonesty and private immorality, which the present forces on the side of public and private virtue are proving wholly unable to control, it is our firm conviction that women, educated to the responsibilities of a participation with men in political rights, would bring to the aid of virtuous men a new and powerful element of good, which cannot be spared, and for which there can be no substitute.

Resolved, That in advocating the opening to woman of this larger sphere, we do not undervalue her relations as a wife and mother, than which none can be more worthy of a true woman's love and pride; but it is only by a full development of her faculties and a wide range for her thought that she can become the true companion of an intelligent husband, and the wise and inspiring educator of her children; while mere domestic life furnishes no occupation to the great number of women who never marry, and a very inadequate one to those who, at middle age, with large experience and ripe wisdom, find their children grown up around them and no longer needing their care.

Resolved, That all laws which recognize a superior right in the husband to the children whom the wife has borne, or a right on the part of the husband to the property of the wife, beyond the right given to her in his property, and all laws which hold that husband and wife do not stand in all respects in the relation of equals, ought to be abrogated, and the perfect equality of husband and wife established.

Resolved, That this equality of position and rights we believe to have been intended by the Creator as the ultimate perfection of the social state, when he said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let THEM have dominion"; and to have been a part of our Savior's plan for a perfect Christian society, in which an Apostle says, "there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female."

The *Hartford Courant*, in its description of the convention, said:

After a speech by Mr. Garrison, the Hutchinsons sang some of the religious songs of the Southern negroes with excellent taste, and then, led by them, the whole audience united in the chorus; and as the melody rose strong and clear a pathos fell upon the assembly that brought tears to many eyes. The tableau upon the stage was striking and memorable. There stood the family of singers, with the same cheerful, hopeful courage in their uplifted faces with which for twenty years they have sung of the good time *almost* here, of every reform; there stood William Lloyd Garrison, stern Puritan, inflexible apostle, his work gloriously done in one reform, lending the weight of his unwearied, solid intellect to that which he believes is the last needed; there was Mrs. Paulina Wright Davis, a Roman matron in figure, her noble head covered with clustering ringlets of white, courageous after a quarter of a century of unsullied devotion, though she had just confessed that sometimes she was almost weary; there was Miss Anthony, unselfish, patient, wise and practical; the graceful Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, the poet of the movement; the tall and elegant Mrs. Celia Burleigh, the benevolent Dr. Clemence Lozier; Mrs. Isabella B. Hooker, with spiritual face and firm purpose, just taking her place in the reform that has long had her heart and deep conviction, and many others of fine presence and commanding beauty—matrons, with gray hair and countenances illuminated with lives of charity; young women, flushed with hope; and as the grand Christian song went on, many a woman, leaning against a supporting pillar, gave way to the tears that would come, tears of hope deferred, tears of weary longings, tears of willing, patient devotion—e'en though it be a cross that

Digitized by Google

raiseth me—and then the benediction, and the assembly dispersed, touched, it may be, into a moment's sympathy. * * *

At the closing evening session the opera house was completely filled by an audience whose attendance was a compliment. * * * The chairman, Rev. N. J. Burton, said: "Has not this convention been a success? I say, emphatically, it has. We have had the very best of audiences at every session, and we have provided speakers as good as the audience. We have not given you even one poor speech. I thank the audience and the speakers, one and all. I feel like thanking everybody, myself included, as chairman. In Stewart's store in New York they told me 1,500 persons were employed, all guided by one brain up-stairs, and that one brain giving the store a national reputation. This convention has been inspired and managed by one person—Mrs. Hooker of this city." After speculating as to the possible oratorical power of Mrs. H., had she received the advantages and enjoyed the practice of her brother, who spoke the previous evening, he said: "But of course Mrs. Hooker couldn't vote, nor be a member of the legislature, or even a justice of the peace. Insufferable nonsense! If such women don't vote before I die—well, like Gough's obstinate deacon, I won't die till they do."

On motion of Franklin Chamberlin, esq., the thanks of the convention were tendered to Mrs. Hooker for her efforts. At her request the chairman said that she was wholly surprised by this reference to herself. She would only say, "Thank God for our success," to which the chairman added, "Amen and Amen." He then introduced Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, daughter of the late Judge Cady of Albany, wife of the Hon. Henry B. Stanton of New York, and editor of *The Revolution*. She is perhaps fifty, and in general appearance much resembles Mrs. Davis. She is apparently in robust health, dresses in black, with just enough of white lace, and, with her gray hair loosely gathered, and her strong, symmetrical and refined face and perfect self-possession, is a noble-looking woman. Her address, or oration, was before her, but she was not hampered by it. Her voice is clear, her gesticulation simple, and her general manner not surpassed by Wendell Phillips. Rough notes of an oration so finished can only indicate the main drift of her thoughts. * * * The eloquent peroration was heard in profound silence, followed by enthusiastic applause. * * * The chairman read the constitution and offered it for signatures, and the officers of the Connecticut Woman Suffrage Association were chosen.*

In *The Revolution* of November 11, 1869, Mrs. Stanton giving a description of the convention, refers to the liberality of the governor, Marshall Jewell, and the genial hospitalities of his noble wife:†

In company with Mrs. Howe and Miss Anthony, we were entertained at the governor's mansion, a fine brick building in the heart of the town. It has a small pond on one side, and eight acres of land, laid out in gardens, walks and lawns, with extensive greenhouses and graperies. The house is spacious, elegantly and tastefully furnished, with all the comforts and luxuries that wealth can command. With a conservatory, library, pictures, statuary, beautiful (strong-minded) wife and charming daughters, the noble governor is in duty bound to remain the happy, genial, handsome man he is to-day. Though the governor, owing to his pressing executive duties, did not honor our convention with his presence, we feel assured, in reading over his last able message, that he feels a deep interest in the education and elevation of women. In speaking of their school system, he calls attention to the low wages of female teachers, and

* *President*, Rev. N. J. Burton, Hartford. *Vice-presidents*, Brigadier-general B. S. Roberts, U. S. A., New Haven; Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, Hartford; Rev. Dr. Joseph Cummings, Middletown; Rev. William L. Gage, Hartford; Rev. Olympia Brown, Bridgeport. *Secretary*, Miss Frances Ellen Burr. *Executive Committee*, Mrs. Isabella B. Hooker, Mrs. Lucy Elmes, Derby; Mrs. J. G. Parsons and Miss Emily Manning, M. D., Hartford. *Treasurer*, John Hooker.

† On her departure for St. Petersburg, where her husband was minister plenipotentiary, Mrs. Jewell left a check of $200 for the State society. She was an honored officer of the National Suffrage Association until the time of her death, in 1883.

Digitized by Google

the injustice of excluding girls from the scientific schools and polytechnic institutions in the State. He says:

I would especially call the attention of the legislature to the importance of furnishing to women such educational facilities as will better fit them for the industrial pursuits which the true progress of the times is opening to them.

On the rights of married women, he says:

While our laws with regard to married women have been amended from time to time for several years past, so as to secure to them in a more ample manner their property, held before or acquired after marriage, yet we are still considerably behind many of our sister States, and even conservative England, in our legislation on the subject. I would recommend to your favorable consideration such an amendment of our laws as will secure to a married woman all her property, with the full control of it during her married life, and free from liability for any debts, except those contracted by herself or for which she has voluntarily made herself responsible, with the same right on the part of the husband to an interest in her property, on his surviving her, that she now has, or that it may be best to give her, in his.

On the subject of divorce the governor says:

I recommend a revision of our laws with regard to divorce. According to the report of the State librarian there were in the State last year 4,734 marriages and 478 divorces. Discontented people come here from other States, to take advantage of what is called our liberal legislation, to obtain divorces which would be denied them at home. As the sacredness of the marriage relation lies at the foundation of civilized society, it should be carefully guarded. Under our present laws the causes of divorce are too numerous, and not sufficiently defined, and too wide a discretion is given to the courts. I think the law of 1849 should be modified, and so much of the statute as grants divorces for "any such misconduct as permanently destroys the happiness of the petitioner, and defeats the purposes of the marriage relation," should be repealed. I would also suggest that the law provide that no decree of divorce shall take effect till one year after it is granted.

In conversation with the governor on this point in his message he stated the singular fact that the majority of the applications for divorce were made by women. If this be so, we suggested that the laws of Connecticut should stand as they are until the women have the right of suffrage, that they may have a voice in a social arrangement in which they have an equal interest with man himself. If Connecticut, with its blue laws, disloyal Hartford convention, and Democracy, has, nevertheless, been a Canada for fugitive wives from the yoke of matrimony, pray keep that little State, like an oasis in the desert, sacred to sad wives, at least until the sixteenth amendment of the federal constitution shall give the women of the republic the right to say whether they are ready to make marriage, under all circumstances, for better or worse, an indissoluble tie. We have grave doubts as to the sacredness of a relation in which the subject-class has no voice whatever in the laws that regulate it. We shall never know what "laws lie at the foundation of all civilized society" until woman's thought finds expression in the State, the church and the home. It is presumption for man longer to legislate alone on this vital question, when woman, too, should have a word to say in the matter.

The morning after the convention we had a pleasant breakfast under Mr. and Mrs. Hooker's hospitable roof, where Boston and New York amicably broke bread and discussed the fifteenth amendment together All the wise and witty sayings that passed around that social board, time fails to chronicle.

In 1877 Governor Hubbard called the attention of the legislature to the wrongs of married women, in the following words:

There has been for the last few years in this State much slip-shod and fragmentary legislation in respect to the property rights of married women. The old common law assumed the subjugation of the wife, and stripped her of the better part of her rights of person and nearly all her rights of property. It is a matter of astonishment that Christian nations should have been willing for eighteen centuries to hold the mothers of their race in a condition of legal servitude. It has been the scandal of jurisprud-

Digitized by Google

ence. Some progress has been made in reforming the law in this State, but it has been done, as I have already said, by patch-work and shreds, sometimes ill-considered, and often so incongruous as to provoke vexatious litigation and defy the wisdom of the courts. The property relations of husband and wife do not to-day rest on any just or harmonious system. Not only has the husband absolute disposal of all his own property freed from all dower rights, but he is practically the owner during coverture of all his wife's estate not specially limited to her separate use; and after her death has, in every case, a life use in all her personal, and in most cases in all her real property, by a title which the wife, no matter what may have been his ill-deserts, is powerless to impair or defeat; whereas, on the other hand, the wife has during the husband's life no more power of her own right to sell, convey, or manage her own estate than if she were a lunatic or slave, and in case of his death has a life use in only one-third part of the real estate of which he dies possessed, and no indefeasible title whatever in any of his personal estate. As a consequence, a husband may strip his wife, by mere voluntary disposition to strangers, of all claim on his estate after his death, and thus add beggary to widowhood.

I am sure this cannot seem right to any fair-minded man. Neither is it strange that some of our countrywomen, stung by the injustice of the law towards their sex, should be demanding, as a mode of redress, a part in the making of the laws which govern them. I am confident there is manhood enough in our own sex to right this obvious wrong to which I have alluded.

I therefore recommend that the law on this subject be so recast that, in all marriages hereafter contracted, the wife shall hold her property and all her earnings for personal services not rendered to her husband or minor children, as a sole and separate estate, with absolute power of disposition in her own name, and that the surviving wife shall have, by law, the same measure of estate in the property of the deceased husband, as the surviving husband shall be allowed to have in the property of his deceased wife. This will reduce their property relations to a principle of equality, and, in my judgment, is demanded by the most obvious dictates of justice and equity. Those who are not satisfied with this can make a different law for themselves by ante-nuptial settlements.

I am not unmindful that the husband alone is liable in the first instance for the support of the family; but this is much more than neutralized by the fact that, in most cases, the wife's whole life is spent in the toilsome and unpaid service of the household, and that the whole drift of her estate, in consequence of her more unselfish and generous nature, is towards the husband's pockets, in spite of all the guards of the law and every consideration of prudence.

Calling attention to this stirring appeal, the *Hartford Times*, Democratic, used the following language:

Another notable feature of the message is its outspoken and manly call for a reformation in our laws concerning the property rights of married women. Here as in other points it is a model message. The governor's experience as a lawyer has brought him often face to face with this disgraceful one-sidedness of our laws on this subject, and in some terse sentences he shows up the injustice more effectively than has ever been done in any of the so-called women's rights conventions.*

---

* Mrs. Hooker writes us that the act passed upon Governor Hubbard's recommendation was prepared at his request by Mr. Hooker, and was essentially the same that had been unsuccessfully urged by him upon the legislature eight years before. She then goes on to say: "What part our society had in our bringing about so beneficent a change in legislation, cannot be better set forth than in two private letters from Samuel Bowles of the *Springfield Republican*, and Governor Hubbard. While these gentlemen were friends of Mr. Hooker and myself, yet, as politically opposed to each other, their united testimony is exceedingly valuable, and since they have both passed on to a world of more perfect adjustments, I feel that nothing would give them greater satisfaction than to be put upon record here as among the earliest defenders of the rights of women.

"SPRINGFIELD, Mass., March 28, 1877.

"MY DEAR MRS. HOOKER:—I return your letters and paper as you desired. It is an interesting story, and a most gratifying movement forward. I am more happy over the bill passed, than I am sorry over the bill that failed. We shall move fast enough. The first great step is this successful measure in Connecti-

The following editorial from the *Springfield Republican*, gives a good digest of the new law passed upon Governor Hubbard's recommendation:

Connecticut has taken a great leap forward in the reform of the property relations of married persons. The law had been long neglected in that State, the obvious right of a married woman to property acquired before marriage, which is now secured in most States by constitutional provision, having been there denied. In Massachusetts, the modification of the former inequalities has gone on by piecemeal, till it is said that in some respects the woman is now the more favored party.

The new Connecticut statute also puts the burden of the family maintenance on the man, as under most circumstances the real bread-winner. It simply lays down the principle of absolute equality in the rights and privileges of the husband and wife, with the above exception. In all marriages hereafter contracted, neither husband nor wife shall acquire any right to or interest in any property of the other, whether held before the marriage or acquired after the marriage, except as provided in this law. The separate earnings of the wife shall be her sole property. She shall have the same right to make contracts with third persons as if she were not married, and to convey her real and personal estate. Her property is liable for her debts and not for his; his is not liable for her debts, except those contracted for the support of the family. Purchases made by either party shall be presumed to be on the private account of the party, but both shall be liable where any article purchased by either shall have in fact gone to the support of the family, or for the joint benefit of both, or for the reasonable apparel of the wife, or for her reasonable support while abandoned by her husband. It shall, however, be the duty of the husband to support his family, and his property, when found, shall be first applied to satisfy any such joint liability. The wife shall be entitled to indemnity for any money of her own used to pay such claims. We have used almost the precise language of the first and second sections of the act.

On the death of either, the survivor shall be entitled to the use for life of one-third the estate of the deceased, which right cannot be defeated by will. If the deceased leaves no children or representatives of children, the survivor is entitled to one-half instead of one-third. When either party gives a legacy to the other, the latter may choose between its rights under the will, and those under the statute. Abandonment without cause may defeat this provision, and a marriage contract may supersede it en-

---

cut—the establishment in practice of the principle of equal, mutual, legal rights, and equal, mutual, legal responsibilities, for which I have been preaching and praying these twenty years. We owe the success this year, *first* to the right of the matter; *second*, to the agitation of the whole question which has disseminated the perception of that right; *third*, to you and your husband in particular; and *fourth*, to the fact that you had in Connecticut this year a governor who was recognized as the leading lawyer of the State, a genuine natural conservative who yet said the measure was right and ought to go. It is this last element that has given Connecticut its chief leadership. It is a bigger thing than it seems at first to have an eminent conservative lawyer on the side of such legislative reform. I hate very much to take your husband's side against you, and yet now that I am over fifty years old, I find I more and more sympathize with his patience and philosophy with the slow-going march of reform. But with such things going forward in national politics, and such a sign in the heavens as this in Connecticut, we ought all to be very happy—and I believe I am, in spite of debts, hard work, fatigue and more or less chronic invalidism. At any rate I salute you both with honor and with affection."

"Very faithfully yours, SAMUEL BOWLES.

"This letter I enclosed to Governor Hubbard and received the following reply:

"EASTER, April 1, 1877.

"MY GOOD FRIEND:—It was a 'Good Friday' indeed that brought your friendly missive. And what a dainty and gracious epistle Sam. Bowles does know how to write! He is a good fellow, upon my word, full of generous instincts and ideas. He ought to be at the head of the *London Times* and master of all the wealth it brings. Add to this, that the Good Physician should heal him of his 'chronic invalidism' and then—well what's the use of dreaming? Thank *yourself*, and such as you for what there is of progress in respect of woman's rights amongst us. I do believe our bill is a 'great leap forward' as Bowles says in his editorial. 'Alas!' says my friend ———, 'it has destroyed the divine conception of the unity of husband and wife.' As divine, upon my soul, as the unity of the lamb and the devouring wolf. * * * But enough of this. I salute you my good friend, with a thousand salutations of respect and admiration. I do not agree with you in all things, but I cannot tell you how much I glorify you for your courage and devotion to womanhood. I am a pretty poor stick for anything like good work in the world, but I am not without respect for it in others. And so I present myself to yourself and to your good and noble husband whom I take to be one of the best, with every assurance of affection and esteem. Thanking you for your kind letter, I remain, dear madam,

"Yours very truly, R. D. HUBBARD."

Digitized by Google

tirely. Parties already married may contract to surrender their present rights for those secured by this statute, such contracts to be recorded in the probate court.

Thus we have a new and clear statute framed in accordance with a simple principle of reform, for which the *Republican* has long done battle—the equality of married persons in their rights and responsibilities of property. The adoption of the reform is due deeply to the general agitation of the rights of women, the efforts of Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker, the Smith girls' cows, and perhaps some flagrant instance of injustice to rich wives by tyrant husbands near the capital. But the great occasion and immediate cause, without which this generation might have pleaded for it in vain, was the perception of the justice of it by Governor Hubbard, and his open advocacy of it in his message. Lawyers have one answer for all reforms regarding property or civil contracts—they are impossible. But here was undeniably the best lawyer in the State who said, and threw the weight of his first State paper on the proposition, that this thing was possible, and, if he said it was possible, there was no man who could gainsay it. The legislature took the reform on its own sense of justice and on the assurance of Richard D. Hubbard, that it would work.

On June 6, 1870, at a second hearing* before the Joint Committee on Woman Suffrage, in the capitol at New Haven, Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford of the Universalist church, Mrs. Benchley and Mrs. Russell were the speakers. During that session of the legislature Mrs. Hanaford acted as chaplain both in the Senate and House of Representatives, and received a check for her services which she valued chiefly as a recognition of woman's equality in the clerical profession.

Mrs. Hooker was ably sustained in her new position by her husband, a prominent lawyer of the State. Being equally familiar with civil and canon law, with Blackstone and the Bible, he was well equipped to meet the opponents of the reform at every point. While Mrs. Hooker held meetings in churches and school-houses through the State, her husband in his leisure hours sent the daily press articles on the subject. And thus their united efforts stirred the people to thought and at last roused a Democratic governor of the State to his duty on this question. From the many able tracts issued and articles published in the journals we give a few extracts. In answer to the common objections of "free love" and "easy divorce," in the *Evening Post* of January 17, 1871, Mr. Hooker said:

The persons who advocate easy divorce would advocate it just as strongly if there was no woman suffrage movement. The two have no necessary connection. Indeed one of the strongest arguments in favor of woman suffrage is, that the marriage relation will be safer with women to vote and legislate upon it than where the voting and legislation are left wholly to the men. Women will always be wives and mothers, above all things else. This law of nature cannot be changed, and I know of nobody

* At the various hearings Mrs. Anna Middlebrook, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Sheldon, Julia and Abby Smith, Rev. Olympia Brown, Mr. and Mrs. Hooker were the speakers.

Digitized by Google

who desires to change it. The marriage relation will therefore always be more to woman than to man, and we, who would give her the right to vote, have no fear to trust to her the sanctity and purity of that relation. It is the opponents of woman suffrage who distrust the fidelity of woman to her divine instincts and dare not let her vote. Our little State has been two hundred years under male legislation, and yet a long memorial from hundreds of clergymen and other Christian men went up to our legislature two years ago, representing our legislation on divorce as demoralizing and as fatal to the best interests of the marriage relation. It really seems as if the incompetency for the management of public affairs which by mere assumption is charged in advance upon women, has been proved with regard to men by an actual experience of many years. The true idea is for man and woman to share together the responsibilities and duties of legislation, and until this is done I have no hope for any real progress towards purity in the administration of our public affairs. We who favor woman suffrage speak confidently on this subject because the reform works so well wherever it has been tried, in England, Sweden, Austria and Wyoming Territory.

No rational man can suppose for a moment that with woman suffrage established in England and on the continent of Europe, we in this country, which so specially stands on equal representation, are going to refuse it. It must be set down as one of the certain things of the future. And when it has come, and women vote, it will excite no more attention or comment than the voting of our colored people.

Now if woman suffrage is to come, is it worth while to be making the impression that the women of our country are not to be trusted with it, and that the marriage relation is to be imperiled by it? Above all, is it manly or just to be charging corrupt motives on nine-tenths of those who advocate the reform? The notoriety which to some extent its advocates must get is almost universally painful to the women who are the subjects of it. One noble woman, whose whole soul is in this cause, and the purity of whose motives in this, as in everything else, I have had good opportunity to learn, said to me, on reading Dr. Bushnell's remark in his book on woman suffrage, that these women were only trying to make themselves men: "Cruel, cruel words! If so noble a man as Dr. Bushnell so utterly fails to comprehend a woman's nature, shall not she be allowed to speak for herself, and no testimony be taken but hers?"*

Much might be said in regard to the most famous women of Connecticut, the historic "Maids of Glastonbury," celebrated for their resistance to taxation. After the death of Abby, July 23, 1878, Mrs. Elizabeth Oakes Smith, in a beautiful tribute to the sisters, said:

Many years ago they took a stand akin to that of the illustrious Hampden, which has made his name a synonym for patriotism as well as just and manly opposition to unconstitutional revenue exaction. "The tax may be a small matter for an English gentleman to pay, but it is too much

* See Appendix for Mr. Hooker's article, "Is the Family the Basis of the State?"

Digitized by Google

for a British freeman to pay," was the ground of his noble resistance, and this view precipitated that great Revolution which more than all other modern movements consolidated and strengthened the rights of the British subject. These two women deserve to stand upon a platform side by side with the great Hampden. Other women have paid their taxes under protest, but Abby and Julia Smith have done more than protest; they have suffered loss as well as inconvenience, their property having been seized and sold again and again because of their honest conviction that taxation without representation was as unjust to women as to men. Their steadfastness has been the more remarkable because, by their social position, their learning and their wealth, they might be supposed to be indifferent to the ballot-box, as so many thus situated claim to be. Abby and her sister were no ordinary women. The family originally consisted of five sisters, all more or less accomplished. The father was a man of learning, a graduate of Yale and a clergyman. The mother was familiar with French and Italian, and no mean astronomer. Thus parented, it is not surprising that the Glastonbury sisters were of marked individualism as well as superior scholarship. They were more or less acquainted with Hebrew, Greek and Latin, and have made a translation of the Bible from these sources, giving its original meaning.

The maids of Glastonbury planted themselves upon the right of the sex to suffrage, from purely philosophic and statesman-like grounds. They had no other disabilities of which to complain—no other grievance—no social ostracism, as is so often charged, and most unjustly, against other advocates of the doctrine. They were unmarried, studious, upright, simple-minded gentlewomen, and were much esteemed and honored in the community in which they lived. They occupied the old homestead, doing their own work, their interests well cared for in the person of Mr. Kellogg, an intelligent tenant of theirs, as well as friend and neighbor.

The *Hartford Post*, in a tender mention of the life and death of Abby, with a brief sketch of the family, thus bears honorable testimony to her worthiness:

In the death of Miss Smith the cause of woman suffrage has met with a severe loss, as her firm resistance to what she believed to be the unjust treatment of women greatly encouraged her companions in the contest; her sister has lost her chief support, and the community in which she lived a faithful friend and a worthy exponent of the virtues of truthfulness, firmness, and adherence to the right as she understood it

The *Hartford Times* said:

A notable woman who died last week was Miss Abigail H. Smith, of Glastonbury, Conn., one of the two sisters who resisted the collection of their taxes on the ground that they had no voice in the levy. It will be remembered that their cows were seized and some of their personal property sold two years ago. Of course there were friends who were willing and anxious to pay the taxes, but the plucky old ladies were fighting for a principle, and they would allow no one to stand in the way. The notoriety, which they neither sought nor avoided, undoubtedly did a great deal to call public attention to the anomalous condition of woman under the law. It would be very hard for any man to argue successfully that he possessed any stronger natural claim to the suffrage than was possessed by these shrewd, honest, energetic old ladies.

Many encouraging letters were written the sisters during their many trials, of which the following is a fair specimen:

Near BOSTON, January 14, 1874.

MY DEAR MADAM: The account of your hardships is interesting, and your action will be highly beneficial in bringing the subject to public notice, and in leading to the correction of a great injustice. The taxation of the property of women, without allowing them any representation, even in town affairs, is so unfair that it seems only necessary to bring it to public view to make it odious and to bring about a change. Therefore you deserve the greater honor, not only because you have suffered in a good cause, but because you have set an example that will be followed, and that will lead to happy results.

Your case has its parallel in every township of New England. In the town where this is written a widow pays into the treasury $7,830 a year, while 600 men, a number equal to half the whole number of voters, pay $1,200 in all. Another lady pays $5,042. Yet neither has a single vote, not even by proxy. That is, each one of 600 men who have no property, who pay only a poll-tax, and many of whom cannot read or write, has the power of voting away the property of the town, while the female *owners* have no power at all. We have lately spent a day in celebrating the heroism of those who threw overboard the tea; but how trifling was the tea-tax, and how small the injustice to individuals compared with this one of our day! The principle, however, was the same—that there should be no taxation where there is no representation. And this is what we ought to stand by. Please to accept the sympathy and respect of one of your fellow citizens. No doubt you will have the same from all in due time; or, at any rate, from all who love to see fair play.

Very truly yours, AMOS A. LAWRENCE.

Miss Abby H. Smith, Glastonbury, Conn.

A marked evidence of the advance of public sentiment was manifested by a decision of the Supreme Court in 1882, by which the women of Connecticut were held to have the right to practice law. The opinion of Chief-Justice Park concerning the legality of the admission of Miss Mary Hall of Hartford to the bar, giving her the right to practice in the courts of the State, is as follows:

This is an application by a woman for admission to the bar of Hartford county. After having completed the prescribed term of study she has passed the examination required and has been recommended by the bar of the county to the Superior Court for admission, subject to the opinion of the court upon the question whether, as a woman, she can legally be admitted. The Superior Court has reserved the case for our advice.

The statute with regard to the admission of attorneys by the court is the 29th section of chapter 3, title 4, of the General Statutes, and is in the following words: "The Superior Court may admit and cause to be sworn as attorneys such persons as are qualified therefor agreeably to the rules established by the judges of said court; and no other person than an attorney so admitted shall plead at the bar of any court of this State, except in his own cause."

Digitized by Google

It is not contended, in opposition to the application, that the language of this statute is not comprehensive enough to include women, but the claim is that at the time it was passed its application to women was not thought of, while the fact that women have never been admitted as attorneys, either by the English courts or by any of the courts of this country, had established a common-law disability, which could be removed only by a statute intended to have that effect.

It is hardly necessary to consider how far the fact that women have never pursued a particular profession or occupied a particular official position, to the pursuit or occupancy of which some governmental license or authority was necessary, constitutes a common-law disability for receiving such license or authority, because here the statute is ample for removing that disability if we can construe it as applying to women; so that we come back to the question whether we are by construction to limit the application of the statute to men alone, by reason of the fact that in its original enactment its application to women was not intended by the legislators that enacted it. And upon this point we remark, in the first place, that an inquiry of this sort involves very serious difficulties. No one would doubt that a statute passed at this time in the same words would be sufficient to authorize the admission of women to the bar, because it is now a common fact and presumably in the minds of legislators, that women in different parts of the country are, and for some time have been, following the profession of law. But if we hold that the construction of the statute is to be determined by the admitted fact that its application to women was not in the minds of the legislators when it was passed, where shall we draw the line? All progress in social matters is gradual. We pass almost imperceptibly from a state of public opinion that utterly condemns some course of action to one that strongly approves it. At what point, in the history of this change, shall we regard a statute, the construction of which is to be affected by it, as passed in contemplation of it? When the statute we are now considering was passed, it probably never entered the mind of a single member of the legislature that black men would ever be seeking for admission under it. Shall we now hold that it cannot apply to black men? We know of no distinction in respect to this rule between the case of a statute and that of a constitutional provision. When our State constitution was adopted in 1818 it was provided in it that every elector should be "eligible to any office in the State," except where otherwise provided in the constitution. It is clear that the convention that framed, and probably all the people who voted to adopt the constitution, had no idea that black men would ever be electors, and contemplated only white men as within any possible application of the provision, for the same constitution provided that only white men should be electors. But now that black men are made electors, will it do to say that they are not entitled to the full rights of electors in respect to holding office, because an application of the provision to them was never thought of when it was adopted? Events that gave rise to enactments may always be considered in construing them. This is little more than the familiar rule that in construing a statute we always inquire what particular mischief it was designed to remedy. Thus, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that in construing the recent amendments of the federal constitution, although they are general in their terms, it is to be considered that they were passed with reference to the exigencies growing out of the emancipation of the slaves, and for the purpose of benefiting the blacks (*Slaughter-house Cases, 16 Wall., 67; Strauder vs. West Virginia, 100 U. S. Reps., 306*). But this statute was not passed for the purpose of benefiting men as distinguished from women. It grew out of no exigency caused by the relation of the sexes. Its object was wholly to secure the orderly trial of causes and the better administration of justice. Indeed, the preamble to the first statute providing for the admission of attorneys, states its object to be "for the well-ordering of proceedings and pleas at the bar."

The statute on this subject was not originally passed in its present form. The first act with regard to the admission of attorneys was that of 1708, which was as follows: "That no person, except in his own cause, shall be admitted to make any plea at the bar without being first approved by the court before whom the plea is to be made, nor

Digitized by Google

until he shall take in the said court the following oath," etc. (Col. Records, 1706 to 1716, page 48). This act seems to have contemplated an approval by the court in each particular case in which an attorney appeared before it. The first act with regard to the general admission of attorneys appears in the revision of 1750, and is as follows: "That the county courts of the respective counties in this colony shall appoint, and they are hereby empowered to approve, nominate and appoint attorneys in their respective counties, as there shall be occasion, to plead at the bar; * * and that no person, except in his own case, shall make any plea at the bar in any court but such as are allowed and qualified attorneys, as aforesaid." Thus the statute stood until the revision of 1821; when, for the first time, it took essentially its present form. Up to this time the word "person" had been used in this statute only in the clause that "no person" should be allowed to practice before the courts except where formally admitted by the court, a use of the word which, of course, could not be regarded as limited to the male sex, as women would undoubtedly have been held to be included in the term. The language of the statute as now adopted was as follows: "The county courts may make such rules and regulations as to them shall seem proper relative to the admission and practice of attorneys; and may approve of, admit and cause to be sworn as attorneys, such persons as are qualified therefor agreeably to the rules established; * * and no person not thus admitted, except in his own cause, shall be admitted or allowed to plead at the bar of any court." The statute in this form passed through the compilations of 1835 and 1838, the revision of 1849 and the compilation of 1854, and appears, with a slight modification, in the revision of 1866. The county courts had now been abolished, and the power to admit attorneys, as well as to make rules on the subject, had been given to the Superior Court; the expression, "such persons," being preserved, and the provision that "no person" not thus admitted should be allowed to plead, being omitted.

The statute finally took its present form in the revision of 1875. It retains the provision that the Superior Court may make rules for the admission of attorneys, and provides that the court "may admit and cause to be sworn as attorneys such persons as are qualified therefor agreeably to the rules established," and restores the provision, dropt in the revision of 1866, that "no person other than an attorney so admitted shall plead at the bar of any court in this State, except in his own cause."

These changes, though not such as to affect the meaning of the statute at any point of importance to the present question, are yet not wholly without importance. The adoption by the legislature of the revision of the statutes becomes, both in law and in fact, a reënactment of the whole body of statutes; and though in determining the meaning of a statute, we are not to regard it as then enacted for the first time, especially if there be no change in its phraseology, yet, where there is such a change, it follows that the attention of the revisers had been particularly directed to that statute, as of course also that of the legislature, and that with the changes made it expresses the present intent of both. Thus, in this case, it is clear that the revisers gave particular thought to the phraseology of the statute we are considering, and put it in a form that seemed to them best with reference to the present state of things, and decided to leave the words "such persons" to stand with full knowledge that they were sufficient to include women, and that women were already following the profession of law in different parts of the country. The legislators must be presumed to have acted with the same consideration and knowledge. It would have been perfectly easy, if either had thought best, to insert some words of limitation or exclusion, but it was not done. Not only so, but a clause omitted in the revision of 1866 was restored, providing that no "person" not regularly admitted should act as an attorney—a term which necessarily included women, and the insertion of which made it necessary, if the word "persons" as used in the first part of the statute should be held not to include women, to give two entirely different meanings to the same word where occurring twice in the same statute and with regard to the same subject matter.

The object of a revision of statutes is, that there may be such changes made in them as the changes in political and social matters may demand, and where no

Digitized by Google

changes are made it is to be presumed that the legislature is satisfied with it in its present form. And where some changes are made in a particular statute, and other parts of it are left unchanged, there is the more reason for the inference from this evidence that the matter of changing the statute was especially considered, that the parts unchanged express the legislative will of to-day, rather than that of perhaps a hundred years ago, when it was originally enacted.

But this statute, in the revision of 1875, is placed immediately after another with regard to the appointment of commissioners of the Superior Court, the necessary construction of which, we think, throws light upon the construction of the statute in question. That act was passed in 1855, after women had begun, with general acceptance, to occupy a greatly enlarged field of industry and some professional and even public positions; and it has been held by the Superior Court, very properly we think, as applying to women, a woman having three years ago been appointed commissioner under it. Its language is as follows: "The Superior Court in any county may appoint any number of persons in such county to be commissioners of the Superior Court, who, when sworn, may sign writs and subpœnas, take recognizances, administer oaths and take depositions and the acknowledgement of deeds, and shall hold office for two years from their appointment." Here the very language is used which is used in the statute with regard to attorneys. In one it is, "any number of persons," in the other, "such persons as are qualified." These two statutes are placed in immediate juxtaposition in the revision of 1875 and deal with kindred subjects, and it is reasonable to presume that the revisers and legislature intended both to receive the same construction. It would seem strange to any common-sense observer that an entirely different meaning should be given to the same word in the two statutes, especially when in giving the narrower meaning to the word in the statute with regard to attorneys, we are compelled to give it a different meaning from that which the same word requires in the next line of the same statute.

We are not to forget that all statutes are to be construed, as far as possible, in favor of equality of rights. All restrictions upon human liberty, all claims for special privileges, are to be regarded as having the presumption of law against them, and as standing upon their defense, and can be sustained if at all by valid legislation, only by the clear expression or clear implication of the law.

We have some noteworthy illustrations of the recognition of women as eligible or appointable to office under statutes of which the language is merely general. Thus, women are appointed in all parts of the country as postmasters. The act of congress of 1825 was the first one conferring upon the postmaster-general the power of appointing postmasters, and it has remained essentially unchanged to the present time. The language of the act is, that "the postmaster-general shall establish post-offices and appoint postmasters." Here women are not included, except in the general term "postmasters," a term which seems to imply a male person; and no legislation from 1825 down to the present time authorizes the appointment of women, nor is there any reference in terms to women until the revision of 1874, which recognizes the fact that women had already been appointed, in providing that "the bond of any married woman who may be appointed postmaster shall be binding on her and her sureties." Some of the higher grades of postmasters are appointed by the president, subject to confirmation by the Senate, and such appointments and confirmations have repeatedly been made. The same may be said of pension agents. The acts of congress on the subject have simply authorized "the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint all pension agents, who shall hold their offices for the term of four years, and shall give bond," etc. At the last session of congress a married woman in Chicago was appointed for a third term pension agent for the State of Illinois, and the public papers stated that there was not a single vote against her confirmation in the Senate. Public opinion is everywhere approving of such appointments. They promote the public interest, which is benefitted by every legitimate use of individual ability, while mere justice, which is of interest to all, requires that all have the

Digitized

fullest opportunity for the exercise of their abilities. These cases are the more noteworthy as being cases of public offices, to which the incumbent is appointed for a term of years, upon a compensation provided by law, and in which he is required to give bond. If an attorney is to be regarded as an officer, it is in a lower sense.

We have had pressed upon us by the counsel opposed to the applicant, the decisions of the courts of Massachusetts, Wisconsin and Illinois, and the United States Court of Claims, adverse to such an application. While not prepared to accede to all the general views expressed in those decisions, we do not think it necessary to go into a discussion of them, as we regard our statute, in view of all the considerations affecting its construction, as too clear to admit of any reasonable question as to the interpretation and effect which we ought to give it.

In this opinion Carpenter and Loomis, Js., concurred; Pardee, J., dissented.

In 1884, the State society held a spirited and successful convention.* Julia Smith gave an extemporaneous talk to the great delight of the audience, who applauded continually; Mrs. Crane, a fine elocutionist, gave a reading from Carlyle; Mrs. Hooker closed with a brief résumé of the work the society had accomplished.

We are also indebted to Frances Ellen Burr for many facts, as the following letter will show:

HARTFORD, September 17, 1885.

MY DEAR MISS ANTHONY: I have received your letter of inquiry. As to that petition in 1867, I was one of the signers, and, probably had something to do with getting the other signatures, though I have nothing but my memory to depend on as to that; but I was pretty much alone here in those days, on the woman suffrage question. Who the other signers were I made an attempt to find out in the secretary of state's office the other day, but found that it would take days, instead of the few hours I had at my command. I find in my journal a reference to Lucy Stone and Mr. Blackwell addressing the committee in the House of Representatives, and that was the committee that made the report afterwards published in *The Revolution.* Mr. Croffut made the opening address on the day of the hearing. He was always ready to aid us in whatever way he could, and I felt grateful to him, for a helping hand was doubly appreciated in those days. I find by the journal of the House for that year that the vote on the question was 93 yeas to 111 nays. The name of Miss Susie Hutchinson heads one petition, with 70 others. How many other petitions there were that year I do not know, but I believe there have been several every year since, besides a number of individual petitions. Since that time the House has voted favorably on the question twice, at least, but I believe we have never had a majority in the Senate.

* At the convention of March 17 and 18, 1884, the speakers were Mrs. Hooker, Susan B. Anthony, the Rev. Charles Stowe, Julia Smith Parker, Mrs. Emily Collins, Abigail Scott Duniway, Miss Leonard, Mrs. C. G. Rogers, the Rev. Dr. A. J. Sage, Mrs. Ellis, Miss Gage, the Rev. J. C. Kimball, the Rev. Mr. Everts of Hartford, Mary Hall and F. E. Burr. The officers elected at this meeting were: Isabella B. Hooker, *President;* F. Ellen Burr, *Secretary;* Mary Hall, *Assistant-secretary;* John Hooker, *Treasurer. Executive Committee:* Mrs. Ellen Burr McManus, Mrs. Emily P. Collins, Mrs. Amy A. Ellis, Mrs. J. G. Parsons Hartford; Mrs. Susan J. Cheney, South Manchester; Mrs. John S. Dobson, Vernon Depot; Judge Joseph Sheldon, Charles Atwater, James Gallagher, New Haven.

Digitized by Google

You ask when I first wrote or spoke for the ballot. My first venture in that line was in 1853. I was then at the age of twenty-two, living with my sister in Cleveland, O., and had never given any attention to the subject of woman suffrage, and cared nothing about it any further than the spirit of rebellion—born with me—against everything unjust, might be said to have made me a radical by nature. In the fall of that year a woman's rights convention met in Cleveland, and I attended it alone, none of the rest of the family caring to go. In my old journal I find this entry:

October 7, 1853. Attended a woman's rights convention which has met here. Never saw anything of the kind before. A Mr. Barker spent most of the morning trying to prove that woman's rights and the Bible cannot agree. The Rev. Antoinette L. Brown replied in the afternoon in defense of the Bible. She says the Bible favors woman's rights. Miss Brown is the best-looking woman in the convention. They appear to have a number of original and pleasing characters upon their platform, among them Miss Lucy Stone—hair short and rolled under like a man's; a tight-fitting velvet waist and linen collar at the throat; bombazine skirt just reaching the knees, and trousers of the same. She is independent in manner and advocates woman's rights in the strongest terms:—scorns the idea of woman *asking* rights of man, but says she must boldly assert her own rights, and *take* them in her own strength. Mrs. Ernestine L. Rose, a Polish lady with black eyes and curls, and rosy cheeks, manifests the independent spirit also. She is graceful and witty, and is ready with sharp replies on all occasions. Mrs. Lucretia Mott, a Philadelphia Quaker, is meek in dress but not in spirit. She gets up and hammers away at woman's rights, politics and the Bible, with much vigor, then quietly resumes her knitting, to which she industriously applies herself when not speaking to the audience. She wears the plain Quaker dress and close-fitting white cap. Mrs. Frances D. Gage, the president, is a woman of sound sense and a good writer of prose and poetry. Mrs. Caroline Severance has an easy, pleasing way of speaking. Mr. Charles Burleigh, a Quaker, appears to be an original character. He has long hair, parted in the middle like a woman's, and hanging down his back. He and Miss Stone seem to reverse the usual order of things.

My first speech in public, I find by my old journal—which serves me better than I thought it would—was given in Music Hall in this city in November, 1870. This meeting was held under the auspices of the State association, and was presided over by the Rev. Olympia Brown. I find that in the winter of 1871 I made addresses in various parts of the State. The journal also tells of a good deal of trotting about to get signatures to petitions, for I had more time to do that thing then than I have now.

The first woman suffrage meeting ever held in Hartford, and the first, probably, in Connecticut, was the one you and Mrs. Stanton held in Allyn Hall in December, 1867. Our State Suffrage Association was organized in October, 1869. The signers* to the call for that convention were quite influential persons.

---

* John Hooker, Isabella B. Hooker, the Rev. N. J. Burton, Rachel C. Burton, Franklin Chamberlin, Francis Gillette, Eliza D. Gillette, Frances Ellen Burr, Catharine E. Beecher, Esther E. Jewell, Calvin E. Stowe, Harriet Beecher Stowe and others, Hartford; Joseph Cummings, Middletown, President of Wesleyan University; Thomas Elmes, Lucy R. Elmes, Derby; Charles Atwater, New Haven; Thomas T. Stone, Laura Stone, Brooklyn. The officers elected for the Association were: *President*, the Rev. N. J. Burton, Hartford; *Secretary*, Frances Ellen Burr; *Executive Committee*, Isabella B. Hooker; Mrs. Lucy R. Elmes, Derby; Mrs. J. G. Parsons, Miss Emily Manning, M. C., Hartford; Mr. Charles Atwater, New Haven; Mr. Ward Cheney, Mrs. Susan J. Cheney, South Manchester; Mrs. Virginia Smith, Hartford. *Treasurer*, William B. Smith, Hartford. There was a long list of vice-presidents, which I presume you do not care for, nor for the other names that were added as changes had to be made in the years that followed.

Digitized

In my hunt through the journals of the two legislative houses I found in the House journal for 1878 that Mr. Pratt of Meriden had presented the petition of Mr. and Mrs. Isaac C. Lewis. Mr. Clark of Enfield, presented the petition of Lucy A. Allen; Mr. Gallagher of New Haven presented several petitions that year, one of them being headed by Mr. Henry A. Stillman of Wethersfield, followed by 532 names, and another by Mrs. D. F. Connor, M. D. Mr. Broadhead of Glastonbury presented the petition of the Smith sisters. This unique petition Miss Mary Hall, who was with me in the secretary's office, chanced to light upon, and she copied it. It is a document well worth handing down on the page of history, and runs as follows:

The Petition of Julia E. Smith and Abby H. Smith, of Glastonbury, to the Senate of the State of Connecticut:

This is the first time we have petitioned your honorable body, having twice come before the House of Assembly, which the last time gave a majority that we should vote in town affairs; but it was negatived in the Senate.

We now pray the highest court in our native State that we may be relieved from the stigma of birth. For forty years since the death of our father have we suffered intensely for being born women. We cannot even stand up for the principles of our forefathers (who fought and bled for them) without having our property seized and sold at the sign-post, which we have suffered four times; and have also seen eleven acres of our meadow-land sold to an ugly neighbor for a tax of fifty dollars—land worth more than $2,000. And a threat is given out that our house shall be ransacked and despoiled of articles most dear to us, the work of lamented members of our family who have gone before us, and all this is done without the least excuse of right or justice. We are told that it is the law of the land made by the legislature and done to us, two defenceless women, who have never broken these laws, made by not half the citizens of this State. And it was said in our Declaration of Independence that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

For being born women we are obliged to help support those who have earned nothing, and who, by gambling, drinking, and the like, have come to poverty, and these same can vote away what we have earned with our own hands. And when men meet to take off the dollar poll-tax, the bill for the dinner comes in for the women to pay. Neither have we husband, or brother, or son, or even nephew, or cousin, to help us. All men will acknowledge that it is as wrong to take a woman's property without her consent as to take a man's without his consent; and such wrong we suffer wholly for being born women, which we are in no wise to blame for. To be sure, for our consolation, we are upheld by the learned, the wise and the good, from all parts of the country, having received communications from thirty-two of our States, as well as from over the seas, that we are in the right, and from many of the best men in our own State. But they have no power to help us. We therefore now pray your honorable body, who have power, with the House of Assembly, to relieve us of this stigma of birth, and grant that we may have the same privileges before the law as though we were born men. And this, as in duty bound, we will ever pray.

Glastonbury, Conn., January 29, 1878. JULIA and ABBY SMITH.

The story of the Smith sisters, from 1873 and on, will be handed down as one of the most original and unique chapters in the history of woman suffrage. Abby Smith, with my friend Mrs. Buckingham, attended with me the first meeting of the Woman's Congress, in New York, in October, 1873. While there, she said she should, on her return, address her town's people on woman suffrage and taxation, as they had not been treated fairly in the matter of their taxes. She did so on the fifth of November,

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1934 L

Yours cordially
Phebe A. Hanaford

Digitized by Google

addressing the Glastonbury town meeting in the little red-brick town-house of that place—a building that will always hereafter be connected with the names of Abby and Julia Smith. Several years after, wishing to address them again, she was refused entrance there, so she and Julia addressed the people from an ox-cart that stood in front. This was after their continued warfare against "taxation without representation" had aroused the opposition of their townsmen, but that first speech in 1873 was the beginning of their fame. Abby sent it to me for publication in the *Times* of this city, but the editor not having room for it sent it to the *Courant*, which gave it a place in its columns, thus (unwittingly) setting a ball in motion that ran all round the country, and even over the ocean. The simplicity and uniqueness of the story of "Abby Smith and her cows," gave a boom to the cause of woman suffrage as welcome as it was unexpected. The Glastonbury mails were more heavily laden than ever before in the history of this hitherto unknown town, for letters came pouring in from all quarters to the sisters. The fame did not rest entirely on Abby and her cows; Julia and her Bible came in for an important share, and the newspaper articles in regard to them were a remarkable blending of cows and Biblical lore, dairy products and Greek and Hebrew. Many of the articles were wide of the facts, being written with a view to make a bright and readable column. For instance, a Chicago paper got up a highly colored article in which it said that Abby Smith's mother—Hannah Hickok—was such an intense student that her father had a glass cage made for her to study in. The only vestage of truth in this story was that, lacking our modern facilities for heating, Mr. Hickok had an extra amount of glass put into the south side of his daughter's room that the sun might give it a little more heat in cold weather. Hannah Hickok seems to have had a mental equipment much above that of the average woman of that day; she had a taste for literature, and was something of a linguist, and wrote, moreover, at different times, quite an amount of readable verse. She had a taste for mathematics, and also for astronomy, and made for her own use an almanac, for these were not so plenty then as now; she could, on awakening, tell any hour of the night by the position of the stars. Evidently Hannah Hickok Smith was not an ordinary woman; and it is quite as evident that her daughters were equally original, though in a different direction. Women who have translated the Bible are not to be met with every day—nor men either, for that matter, but Julia Smith not only did this, but translated it five times,—twice from the Hebrew, twice from the Greek, and once from the Latin; and thirty years later, or after the age of eighty, published the translation; and then, to crown the list of marvels, married at the age of eighty-five.

One point more, and the one nearest my heart. You ask me about my "dear friend Mrs. Buckingham." I can give no details of her suffrage work, but her heart was in it, and her name should be handed down in your History. She was at one time chairman of the executive committee of our State association, and she would, if she had thought it necessary, have spent of her little income to the last cent to help along the cause. She made public addresses and wrote many suffrage articles and letters that

Digitized by Google

were published in different papers, but she made no noise about it; her work was all done with her own characteristic gentleness. Generous to a fault, winning and beautiful as the flowers she scattered on the pathway of her friends, she passed on her way; and one memorable Easter morning she left us so gently that none knew when the sleep of life passed into the sleep of death; we only knew that the glorious light of her eyes —a light like that which "never shone on sea or land"—had gone out forever.

"She died in beauty like the dew
Of flowers dissolved away;
She died in beauty like a star
Lost on the brow of day."

The Hartford Equal Rights Club* was organized in March, 1885, and holds semi-monthly meetings. Its membership is not large, but what it lacks in numbers it makes up in earnestness. Its proceedings are reported pretty fully and published in the *Hartford Times*, which has a large circulation, thus gaining an audience of many thousands and making its proceedings much more important than they would otherwise be. It is managed as simply as possible, and is not encumbered with a long list of officers. There are simply a president, Mrs. Emily P. Collins;† a vice-president, Miss Mary Hall; and a secretary, Frances Ellen Burr, who is also the treasurer. Debate is free to all, the platform being perfectly independent, as far as a platform can be independent within the limits of reason. Essays are read and debated, and many interesting off-hand speeches are made. It is an entirely separate organization from the Connecticut State Suffrage Association, founded in 1869. But its membership is not confined to the city; it invites people throughout the State, or in other States, to become members—people of all classes and of all beliefs. Opponents of woman suffrage are always welcome, for these furnish the spice of debate. Among the topics discussed has been that of woman and the church, and upon this subject Mrs. Stanton has written the club several letters.

Last spring (1885) a number of the members of the club were given hearings before the Committee on Woman Suffrage in the legislature in reference to a bill then under consideration, which was exceedingly limited in its provisions. The House of Representatives improved it and then passed it, but it was afterwards defeated in the Senate. Some of the meetings of the club have been held in Hartford's handsome capitol, a room having been allowed for its use, and a number of members of the House of Representatives have taken part in the discussions. Mrs. Collins, president of the club, is always to be depended upon for good work, and Miss Hall, its vice-president, is active and efficient. She is in herself an illustration of what women can become if they only have sufficient confidence and force of will. She is a practicing lawyer, and a successful one.

* A member of the club says: "We receive more of our life and enthusiasm from Frances Ellen Burr than all other members combined; indeed, the chief part of the work rests on her shoulders."

† See Mrs. Collins's Reminiscences, chapter V., Vol. I.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXXIII.

RHODE ISLAND.

Senator Anthony in *North American Review*—Convention in Providence—Work of State Association—Report of Elizabeth B. Chace—Miss Ida Lewis—Letter of Frederick A. Hinckley—Last Words from Senator Anthony.

RHODE ISLAND, though one of the smallest, is, in proportion to the number of its inhabitants, one of the wealthiest states in the Union. In political organization Rhode Island, in colonial times, contrasted favorably with the other colonies, nearly all of which required a larger property qualifiation, and some a religious test for the suffrage. The home of Roger Williams knew nothing of such narrowness, but was an asylum for those who suffered persecution elsewhere. Nevertheless this is now, in many respects, the most conservative of all the States.

In the November number of the *North American Review* for 1883, Senator Anthony, in an article on the restricted suffrage in Rhode Island, stoutly maintains that suffrage is not a natural right, and that in adhering to her property qualification for foreigners his State has wisely protected the best interests of the people. In his whole argument on the question, he ignores the idea of women being a part of the people, and ranks together qualifications of sex, age, and residence. He quite unfairly attributes much of Rhode Island's prosperity—the result of many causes—to her restricted suffrage. His position in this article, written so late in life, is the more remarkable as he had always spoken and voted in his place in the United States Senate (where he had served nearly thirty years) strongly in favor of woman's enfranchisement. And the *Providence Journal*, which he owned and controlled, was invariably respectful and complimentary towards the movement.

While such a man as Senator Anthony, one of the political leaders in his State, regarded suffrage as a privilege which society may concede or withhold at pleasure, we need not wonder that

Digitized by Google

so little has been accomplished there in the way of legislative enactments and supreme-court decisions. Nevertheless that State has shared in the general agitation and can boast many noble men and women who have taken part in the discussion of this subject.

The first woman suffrage association was formed in Rhode Island in December, 1868. In describing the initiative steps, Elizabeth B. Chace in a letter to a friend, says:

In October 1868, while in Boston attending the convention that formed the New England society, Paulina Wright Davis * conceived the idea that the time had come to organize the friends of suffrage in Rhode Island. After consultation with a few of the most prominent friends of the cause, a call was issued for a convention, to be held in Roger Williams Hall, Providence, December 11th, signed by many leading names. No sooner did the call appear than, as usual, some clergyman publicly declared himself in opposition. The Rev. Mark Trafton, a Methodist minister, gave a lecture in his vestry on "The Coming Woman," who was to be a good housekeeper, dress simply, and not to vote. This was published in the *Providence Journal*, and called out a gracefull vindication of woman's modern demands from the pen of Mrs. Sarah Helen Whitman, the poet, and Miss Norah Perry, a popular writer of both prose and verse. The convention was all that its most ardent friends could have desired, and resulted in forming an association.† The audience numbered over a thousand, at the different sessions, and among the speakers were some of the ablest men in the State. Though the friends were comparatively few in the early days, yet there was no lack of enthusiasm and self-sacrifice. Weekly meetings were held, tracts and petitions circulated; conventions ‡ and legislative hearings were as regular as the changing seasons, now in Providence, and now in Newport, following the migratory government.

Mrs. Davis was president of the association for several successive years in which her labors were indefatigable. Finally failing

* To Mrs. Davis, a native of the State of New York, belongs the honor of inaugurating this movement in New England, as she called and managed the first convention held in Massachusetts in 1850, and helped to arouse all these States to action in 1868. With New England reformers slavery was always the preëminently pressing question, even after the emancipation of the slaves, while in New York woman's civil and political rights were considered the more vital question.—[E. C. S.

† *The Revolution* of December 17, 1868, says: The meeting last week in Providence, was, in numbers and ability, eminently successful. Mrs. Elizabeth B. Chace, of Valley Falls, presided, and addresses were made by Colonel Higginson, Paulina Wright Davis, Lucy Stone, Frederick Douglass, Mrs. O. Shepard, Rev. John Boyden, Dr. Mercy B. Jackson, Stephen S. and Abbey Kelly Foster. The officers of the association were: *President*, Paulina Wright Davis. *Vice-presidents*, Elizabeth B. Chace of Valley Falls, Col., T. W. Higginson of Newport, Mrs. George Cushing, J. W. Stillman, Mrs. Buffum of Woonsocket and P. W. Aldrich. *Recording Secretary*, Martha W. Chase. *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Rhoda Fairbanks. *Treasurer*, Mrs. Susan B. Harris. *Executive Committee*, Mrs. James Bucklin, Catharine W. Hunt, Mrs. Lewis Doyle, Anna Aldrich, Mrs. S. B. G. Martin, Dr. Perry, Mrs. Churchill, Arnold B. Chace.

‡ Among the speakers at these annual conventions we find Rowland G. Hazard, Rev. John Boyden, Rev. Charles Howard Malcolm, the brilliant John Neal, Portland, Maine, Hon. James M. Stillman Gen. F. G. Lippett, Theodore Tilton, Rev. Olympia Brown, Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford, Elizabeth K. Churchill. For a report of the convention held at Newport during the fashionable season, August 25, 26, 1869, see vol. II., page 403, also *The Revolution*, September 2, 1869.

Digitized by Google

health compelled her to resign her position as president of the association.* Since then her able coadjutor Elizabeth B. Chace, has been president of the Rhode Island Suffrage Association, and with equal faithfulness and persistence, carried on the work. She steadily keeps up the annual conventions and makes her appeals to the legislature. Among the names † of those who have appeared from year to year before the Rhode Island legislature we find many able men and women from other States as well as many of their own distinguished citizens.

In this State an effort was made early to get women on the board of managers for schools, prisons and charitable institutions. In a letter to Mrs. Davis, John Stuart Mill says:

I am very glad to hear of the step in advance made by Rhode Island in creating a board of women for some very important administrative purpose. Your proposal that women should be empanneled on every jury where women are to be tried seems to me very good, and calculated to place the injustice to which women are subjected at present by the entire legal system in a very striking light.

In 1873 an effort was made to place women on the Providence School Board, with what success the following extracts from the daily papers show. The *Providence Press* of April 25, 1873, says:

A shabby trick was perpetrated by the friends of John W. Angell, which was certainly anything but "angelic," and which ought to consign the parties who committed it to political infamy.

Yesterday, for the first time in the history of this city, women were candidates for political honors—in the fifth ward, Mrs. Sarah E. H. Doyle, and in the fourth ward, Mrs. Rhoda A. F. Peckham, were candidates for positions on the school committee; both, however, failed of an election. Mrs. Doyle received the unanimous nomination of the large primary meeting of the National Union Republican party, and Mrs. Peckham was run as an outside candidate against the regular nominee. These ladies would undoubtedly have made excellent members of the committee, and, unlike a great portion of that body, would have been found in their places at the meetings, and we should have been glad to have seen the experiment tried of women in the position for which their names were presented. When the polls opened in the fifth ward, instead of Mrs. Doyle's name being on the ballots for the place to which she had been nominated there appeared the name of John W. Angell, esq., and until about 11

* Mrs. Chace says in a letter, speaking of Mrs. Davis: "After several years absence in Europe she returned, a helpless invalid, unable to resume her labors. But her devotion in early years will long remain fresh in the memory of those associated with her, who were inspired by her self-sacrifice and enthusiasm." For farther details of Mrs. Davis' earlier labors, see vol., I, pages 215, 283.

† Julia Ward Howe, Celia Burleigh, William Lloyd Garrison, Aaron M. Powell, Caroline H. Dall, Mrs. Ednah D. Cheney, Miss Mary F. Eastman, Elizabeth K. Churchill, Rev. Augustus Woodbury Hon. Amasa M. Eaton, Mr. Stillman, Hon. Thomas Davis, Hon. George L. Clarke, Rev. Frederick Hinckley, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Hon. A. Payne.

Digitized by Google

o'clock A. M. he had the field to himself. At that hour, however, Mrs. Doyle's friends appeared with the "*regular*" nomination, and from that time to the close of the polls she received 145 votes; Mr. Angell, notwithstanding his several hours' start in the race, only winning by a majority of 38. From this fact it is clear that had Mrs. Doyle's name been in its proper place at the opening of the polls she would have beaten her opponent handsomely. Mrs. Peckham's opponent obtained but 23 majority in a poll of 349. It is evident from the vote yesterday, that if they have but a fair show, women will at the next election be successful as candidates for the school committee. Had the intelligent ladies of the fifth ward been allowed to vote, Mrs. Doyle would have led even the gubernatorial vote of that ward.

The *Providence Journal* makes the following comment:

We are sorry to observe that the two estimable and admirably qualified ladies whose names were presented for school committee in this city, failed of success. Their influence in official connection with the schools could not have been other than salutary. The treatment accorded Mrs. Doyle in the fifth ward was wofully shabby. Without her solicitation, the Republican caucus unanimously nominated her for a member of the school committee. Being a novice in political proceedings, she naturally enough supposed that the party that desired her services so much as to place her in nomination, would make provision for electing their candidate. There was not gallantry enough in the ward, however, for that duty, and it was not until 11 o'clock on election day that any tickets bearing the name of Mrs. Doyle were to be found in the ward-room; but a ticket with the names of two men was on hand at sunrise, and the time lost in procuring tickets for the regular nominee proved fatal to her success. Mrs. Doyle has now learned something of the ways of politicians, and is not likely to put her trust again in the faithfulness of ward committees.

At a meeting of the State association, held in Providence, on Thursday, May 18, 1871, the following preamble and resolutions were, after a full and earnest discussion, unanimously adopted:

WHEREAS, It is claimed, in opposition to the demand that the elective franchise shall be given to women, that they are represented in the government by men, so that they do not need the ballot for their protection, inasmuch as all their rights are secured to them by the interest of these men in their welfare; and, whereas, in February last, in view of the appalling facts frequently coming to our notice, consequent upon the mismanagement of poor-houses and asylums for the insane, this association did earnestly petition our State legislature to enact a law providing for the appointment of women in all the towns in our State to act as joint commissioners with men in the care and control of these institutions; and, whereas, in utter disregard of our request, the Committee on State Charities, to whom it was referred, in reporting back our petition to the House of Representatives, did recommend that the petitioners be given leave to withdraw, and the House, without (so far as we could learn) one word of protest from any member thereof, did so dispose of our petition; therefore,

Resolved, That this association do most solemnly declare, that so far from being represented in our legislature, the rights of the women of this State were in this instance trampled under foot therein, and the best interests of humanity, in the per-

sons of the poorest and most unfortunate classes, were not sufficiently regarded, under this system of class legislation.

Resolved, That, despairing of obtaining for women even the privileges which would enable them to look after the welfare of the destitute and the suffering, with any power or authority to improve their condition, until equal rights in the government itself are guaranteed to all without regard to sex, we will henceforth make use of this treatment we have received as a new argument in favor of the emancipation of women from the legal status of idiots and criminals, and, with this weapon in our hands, we will endeavor to arouse the women of our State to a keener sense of their degraded condition, and we will never abate our demand until an amendment to the constitution is submitted to the people granting suffrage to the women of Rhode Island.

Resolved, That this preamble and these resolutions be offered for publication to the daily papers of this city. ELIZABETH B. CHACE, *President.*

SUSAN B. P. MARTIN, *Secretary.*

For several years the philanthropic women of Rhode Island made many determined efforts to secure some official positions in the charitable institutions of the State, with what success the following report by Elizabeth B. Chace, at the annual meeting of the American Association, in Philadelphia, in 1876, will show:

The Rhode Island Woman Suffrage Association, while holding its monthly meetings through the year, circulating petitions to the legislature, and, in other ways, constantly endeavoring to revolutionize the entire sentiment of the State on the question of woman suffrage, still has less progress to report than its friends would have desired. Our last annual meeting, as usual, drew together a large audience. Among our speakers from abroad was William Lloyd Garrison, who, in a speech of almost anti-slavery force and fervor, appeared to send conviction into many minds. Our home speakers included a clergyman of Providence and one of our ablest lawyers, and an ex-legislator who had never stood on our platform before.

As usual, our petitions went into the legislature. They were referred to the Judiciary Committee, before whom we had a hearing, at which three Providence lawyers gave us their unqualified support and earnest advocacy. One of these men set forth in the strongest light the injustice of our laws in regard to the property of married women and their non-ownership of their minor children. The committee made no report to the legislature, and so our petitions lie over until the next session, when we hope for some evidence of progress. In the meantime we intend to very much increase their number. For many years we have been begging of our law-makers to permit women to share in the management of the penal, correctional and charitable institutions of the State; we have, however, only succeeded in obtaining an advisory board of women, which has been in operation for the last six years.

Last spring a majority of these women, having become weary of the service in which they had no power to decide that any improvement should be made in the management of these institutions, resigned their positions on this board, some of them giving through the press their reasons therefor. When the time came for making the new appointments

Digitized by Google

for the year, the governor earnestly urged these women to permit him to appoint them, voluntarily pledging himself to recommend at the opening of the next session of the legislature, that a bill should be passed providing for the appointment of women on the boards of management of all these prisons and reformatories, with the same power and authority with which the men are invested, who now alone decide all questions concerning them. On this condition these women consented to serve on the advisory board a few months longer, with the understanding that, if the legislature fails to make this important provision, their advice will be withdrawn, and the men will be left to take care of thieves, criminals and paupers until they are ready to ask for our help on terms of equality and justice.

In the *Providence Journal* appeared the following:

Mrs. Doyle seems to have learned by experience that the board, as now constituted under the law, can have no real efficiency. The ladies are responsible for the management of no part of any of the institutions which they are permitted officially to visit. Their reports are not made to the boards which are charged with the responsibility of managing these institutions, and, in the case of the reform school, are not made to the body which elects and controls the board of management. The State ought not to place ladies in such an anomalous position. The women's board should have positive duties and direct responsibilities in its appropriate sphere, or it should be abolished. The following is Mrs. Doyle's letter of resignation:

To His Excellency Henry Lippitt, Governor of the State:

SIR: Please accept my resignation as member of the Board of Lady Visitors to the Penal and Correctional Institutions of the State. The recent action of a part of the board, in regard to the annual report made to the General Assembly, makes it impossible for me to continue longer as a member. Before the report was submitted, it was carefully examined by the members signing it, and was acquiesced in by them, as their signatures testify. Still further, I am confirmed in the opinion that so important a trust as this should be coupled with some power for action; without this we are necessarily confined to suggestions only to the male boards, which suggestions receive only the attention they may consider proper. Believing that this board, as now empowered, can have no efficiency except where its suggestions or criticisms meet the entire approval of the male boards, and failing to see any good which can result from our inspections under such conditions, or any honor to the board thus examining, I respectfully tender my resignation. SARAH E. H. DOYLE.

Providence, R. I.

Three more ladies of the Women's Board of Visitors to the Penal and Correctional Institutions of the State attest the correctness of the repeated suggestions that the board, as organized under the existing laws, must be comparatively powerless for good. The question now comes, will the Rhode Island General Assembly enact a law which shall give to women certain definite duties and responsibilities in connection with the care and correction of female offenders? We propose to refer to this matter further. We are requested to publish the following communications to his excellency, the governor:

Digitized by Google

To Henry Lippitt, Governor of Rhode Island:

My appointment on the Women's Board of Visitors to the Penal and Correctional Institutions of the State, which I received from your hands for this year, I am now compelled respectfully to resign. My experience in this board for nearly six years has convinced me that this office, which confers on its holders no power to decide that any improvement shall be made in the government or workings of these institutions, is so nearly useless that I am forced to the conclusion that, for myself, the time spent in the performance of its duties can be more effectively employed elsewhere. That the influence of women is indispensable to the proper management of these institutions I was never more sure than I am at this moment; but to make it effectual, that influence must be obtained by placing women on the boards of direct control, where their judgment shall be expressed by argument and by vote.

A board of women, whose only duties, as defined by the law, are to visit the penal and correctional institutions, elect its own officers and report annually to the legislature, bears within itself the elements of weakness and insufficiency. And if the annual reports contain any exposure of abuses, they are sure to give offense to the managers, to be followed by timidity and vacillation in the board of women itself. Our late report, written with great care and conscientious adherence to the truth, which called the attention of the legislature to certain abuses in one of our institutions, and to some defect in the systems established in the others, has, thus far, elicited no official action, has brought censure upon us from the press, while great dissatisfaction has been created in our own body by the failure of a portion of its members to sustain the allegations to which the entire board, with the exception of one absentee, had affixed their names.

When the State of Rhode Island shall call its best women to an equal participation with men in the direction of its penal and reformatory institutions, I have no doubt they will gladly assume the duties and responsibilities of such positions; and I am also sure that the beneficent results of such coöperation will soon be manifest, both in benefit to individuals and in safety to the State. But under present circumstances I most respectfully decline to serve any longer on the advisory board of women.

Valley Falls, R. I. ELIZABETH B. CHACE.

GOVERNOR LIPPITT: *Dear Sir:* When I accepted an appointment on the Ladies' Board of Visitors to the Penal and Correctional Institutions of the State, I did so with the hope that much good might be accomplished, especially toward the young girls at the reform school, in whose welfare I felt a deep interest. To that institution my attention has been chiefly devoted during my brief experience in this office. This experience, however, has convinced me that a board of officers constituted and limited like this can have very little influence toward improvement in an institution whose methods are fixed, and which is under the exclusive control of another set of officers, who see no necessity for change. Those causes render this women's board so weak in itself that I cannot consent to retain my position therein. I therefore respectfully tender to you my resignation. ABBY D. WEAVER.

Providence, R. I.

GOVERNOR LIPPITT: Please accept the resignation of my commission as a member of the Ladies' Board of Visitors to the Penal and Correctional Institutions of the State, conferred by you in June, 1875. Yours respectfully,

Westerly, R. I. ELIZA C. WEEDEN.

Early in the year 1880 the State association issued the following address:

To the friends of Woman Suffrage throughout the State of Rhode Island:

In behalf of the Rhode Island Woman Suffrage Association, we beg leave to call your attention to the result of our last year's work, and to our plans for future effort. We went before the General Assembly with

petitions for suffrage for women on all subjects, and also with petitions asking only for school suffrage. The former, bearing nearly 2,500 names, was presented in the Senate and finally referred, with other unfinished business, to the next legislature; they will thus be subject to attention the coming year. The latter, bearing nearly 3,500 names, was presented in the House and referred to the Committee on Education. This committee reported unanimously:

Resolved, That the following amendment to the constitution of the State is hereby proposed: Article —. Women otherwise qualified are entitled to vote in the election of school committees and in all legally organized school-district meetings.

This resolution was adopted in the House by 48 to 11, but rejected in the Senate by 20 to 13.* Nineteen members being required to make a majority of a full Senate, the amendment failed by six votes. Had the ballots in the two branches been upon a proposition to extend general suffrage to women, they would have been the most encouraging, and, as it is, they show signs of progress; but a resolve to submit the question of school suffrage to the voters of Rhode Island, ought to have been successful this year. Why was it defeated? Simply for the lack of political power behind it. To gain this, our cause needs a foothold in every part of the State. We need some person or persons in each town, to whom we can look for hearty coöperation. If our work is to be effective, it must not only continue as heretofore—one of petitioning—but must include also a constant vigilance in securing senators and representatives in the General Assembly, favorable to woman suffrage. We propose the coming year:

First—To petition congress in behalf of the following amendment to our national constitution, viz.:

ARTICLE XVI. Section 1—The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Section 2—Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Second—To secure a hearing and action upon the petitions referred from the last Assembly, for such amendment to our State constitution as shall extend general suffrage to women.

---

* IN THE HOUSE. *For the Amendment.*—Davis Aldrich, North Smithfield; Thomas Arnold, Warwick; Clark Barber, Richmond; Thos. P. Barnefield, Pawtucket; Frank M. Bates, Pawtucket; John Beattie, Cranston; Amos M. Bowen, Providence; Issac B. Briggs, Jamestown; Albert Buffum, Burillville; John C. Burrington, Barrington; Chas. Capwell, West Greenwich; Geo. B. Carpenter, Hopkinton; Obadiah Chase, Warren; Albert L. Chester, Westerly; Chas. E. Chickering, Pawtucket; John F. Clark, Cumberland; LeBaron B. Colt, Bristol; James Davis, Pawtucket; Benjamin T. Eames, Providence; Henry H. Fay, Newport; Edward L. Freeman, Lincoln; Z. Herbert Gardner, Exeter; John P. Gregory, Lincoln; Henry D. Heydon, Warwick; Edwin Jenckes, Pawtucket; Thos. E. Kenyon, East Greenwich; Israel B. Mason, Providence; B. B. Mitchell, jr., New Shoreham; Francis L. O'Reilly, Woonsocket; Joseph Osborn, Tiverton; Abraham Payne, Providence; James M. Pendleton, Westerly; Wm. A. Pirce, Johnston; Clinton Puffer, Woonsocket; Olney W. Randall, No. Providence; John P. Sanborn, Newport; Wm. P. Sheffield, Newport; Israel R. Sheldon, Warwick; Martin S. Smith, Scituate; Wm. H. Spooner, Bristol; Henry A. Stearns, Lincoln; Simon S. Steere, Smithfield; Joseph Tillinghast, Coventry; Wm. C. Townsend, Newport; Stephen A. Watson, Portsmouth; Stillman White, Providence; Benj. F. Wilbor, Little Compton; Andrew Winsor, Providence—48.

IN THE SENATE. *For the Amendment.*—Lieut.-Gov. Howard, E. Providence; Ariel Ballou, Woonsocket; Cyrus F. Cooke, Foster; Edward T. DeBlois, Portsmouth; Rodney F. Dyer, Johnston; Anson Greene, Exeter; Daniel W. Lyman, No. Providence; Jabez W. Mowry, Smithfield; Dexter B. Potter, Coventry; Stafford W. Razee, Cumberland; T. Mumford Seabury, Newport; Lewis B. Smith, Barrington; John F. Tobey, Providence—13.

Digitized by Google

Third—To petition the General Assembly for the necessary legislation to secure school suffrage to women.

The arguments in the various hearings before the legislature with the majority and minority reports, are the same as many already published, in fact nothing new can be said on the question. As none of the women in this State, by trying to vote, or resisting taxation, have tested the justice of their laws, they have no supreme-court decisions to record.

Honorable mention should be made of Dr. William F. Channing, who has stood for many years in Providence the noblest representative of liberal thought. He is a worthy son of that great leader of reform in New England, Rev. William Ellery Channing. In him the advocates of woman's rights have always found a steadfast friend. He sees that this is the fundamental reform; that it is the key to the problems of labor, temperance, social purity and the coöperative home. Those who have had the good fortune of a personal acquaintance with Dr. Channing have felt the sense of dignity and self-respect that the delicate courtesy and sincere reverence of a noble man must always give to woman.

Though Mrs. Channing has not been an active participant in the popular reforms, having led a rather retired life, yet her sympathies have been with her husband in all his endeavors to benefit mankind. She has given the influence of her name to the suffrage movement, and extended the most generous hospitalities to the speakers at the annual conventions. Their charming daughters, Mary and Grace, fully respond to the humanitarian sentiments of their parents, constituting a happy family united in life's purposes and ambitions.

The New York *Evening Post* of September, 1875, gives the following of one of Rhode Island's brave women, but the State has not as yet, thought it worth while to honor her in any fitting manner:

Yesterday noon Miss Ida Lewis again distinguished herself by rescuing a man who was in danger of drowning in the lower Newport harbor. Miss Lewis first came into prominence in 1866, when she saved the life of a soldier who had set out for a sail in a light skiff. It was one of the coldest and most blustering days ever known in this latitude, yet a girl but 25 years old, impelled by the noblest spirit of humanity, ventured to the assistance of a man who had brought himself into a sorry plight through sheer fool-hardiness. One day, during the autumn

* [Signed:] *President*, Elizabeth B. Chace; *Secretaries*, Fanny P. Palmer, Elizabeth C. Hinckley; *Treasurer*, Susan B. P. Martin; *Executive Committee*, Sarah E. H. Doyle, Susan Sisson, William Barker, Francis C. Frost, Anna E. Aldrich, Frederick A. Hinckley, Susan G. Kenyon, Rachael E. Fry, A. A. Tyng, Arnold B. Chace.

Digitized by Google

of the next year, while a terrible gale was raging, two men sat out to cross the harbor with several sheep. One of the animals fell overboard while the boat was rocked by the heavy sea, and its keepers, in trying to save it, were in imminent peril of swamping their craft. Ida Lewis saw them from the window of her father's lighthouse on Lime Rock, and in a few minutes was rowing them in safety toward the shore. After landing the men, she went back again and rescued the sheep.

These brave deeds, with others of a less striking character, made Miss Lewis' name famous throughout the world, and won for her the title of "the Grace Darling of America"; but in 1869 the newspapers were filled with the story of what was perhaps her greatest exploit. On March 29 two young soldiers set sail from Newport for Fort Adams in a small boat, under the guidance of a boy who pretended to understand the simple rules of navigation. Mrs. Lewis chanced to be looking out of the lighthouse window, and saw a squall strike the boat and overturn it. She called to her daughter, telling her of the casualty. Ida, though ill at the time, rushed out of the house, launched her life-boat and sprang in, with neither hat on her head nor shoes on her feet. By the time she reached the scene of the disaster the boy had perished, and the two soldiers were clinging desperately to the wreck, almost ready to loose their hold from exhaustion. They were dragged into the life-boat, and carried to Lime Rock, and, with careful nursing, were soon sufficiently restored to proceed to Fort Adams.

Miss Lewis' repeated acts of philanthropy have been recognized by gifts at various times, but no national testimonial, so far as we are aware, has yet been offered to her. True generosity, like true virtue, is its own reward, and we of the world are not often disposed to meddle with its quiet enjoyment by its possessor. It seems eminently fitting, however, that among the first to receive the new decoration to be bestowed by congress for heroic deeds in saving life, should be the heroine of Newport harbor.

Writing from Valley Falls September 9, 1885, Elizabeth B. Chace, president of the Rhode Island Association, in summing up the steps of progress, says:

On December 4, 1884, by unanimous consent of our General Assembly the state-house was granted to us for the first time, for a woman suffrage convention. A large number of our best men and women, and some of our ablest speakers* were present. An immense audience greeted them and listened with eager interest throughout. The occasion was one of the most pleasant and profitable we have enjoyed in a long time. At the following session of our Legislature, 1885, an amendment to our State constitution was proposed giving the franchise to women, on equal terms with men. It passed both Houses by a large majority vote, but by some tech-

* The speakers were Abraham Payne, John Wyman, Matilda Hindman, Frederick A. Hinckley, Rev. Mr. Wendt, Elizabeth B. Chace, William I. Bowditch, Mary F. Eastman, William Lloyd Garrison, jr., Lucy Stone, Susan B. Anthony, Frederick Douglass, Henry B. Blackwell.

Digitized by Google

nicality, for which no one seemed to blame, it was not legally started on its round to the vote of the people. Hence the proposition to submit the amendment will be again passed upon this year, and with every promise of success. We have strong hopes of making our little commonwealth the banner State in this grand step of progress.

The following letter from Frederick A. Hinckley, makes a fitting mention of some of the noble women who have represented this movement in his State:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., Sept. 14, 1885.

DEAR FRIENDS: You ask for a few words from me concerning salient points in the history of the woman suffrage movement in Rhode Island. As you know, ours is a very small State—the smallest in the Union—and has a very closely compacted population. With us the manufacturing interest overshadows everything else, representing large investments of capital. On the one hand we have great accumulations of wealth by the few; on the other hand, a large percentage of unskilled foreign labor. For good or for ill we feel all those conservative influences which naturally grow out of this two-fold condition. This accounts in the main, for the Rhode Islander's extreme and exceptionally tenacious regard for the institutions of his ancestors. This is why we have the most limited suffrage of any State, many *men* being debarred from voting by reason of the property qualification still required here of foreign-born citizens. Such a social atmosphere is not favorable to the extension of the franchise, either to men or women, and makes peculiarly necessary with us, the educational process of a very large amount of moral agitation before much can be expected in the way of political changes.

My own residence here dates back only to 1878, though before that from my Massachusetts home I was somewhat familiar with Rhode-Island people and laws. Our work has consisted of monthly meetings, made up usually of an afternoon session for address and discussion, followed by a social tea; of an annual State convention in the city of Providence; and of petitioning the legislature each year, with the appointment of the customary committees and hearings. For many years the centre of the woman movement with us has been the State association, and since my own connection with that, the leader about whom we have all rallied, has been your beloved friend and mine, Elizabeth B. Chace. Hers is that clear conception of, and untiring devotion to principles, which make invincible leadership, tide over all disaster, and overcome all doubt. By her constant appearance before legislative committees, her model newspaper articles which never fail to command general attention even among those who would not think of agreeing with her, and by her persistent fidelity to her sense of duty in social life, she is the recognized head of our agitation in Rhode Island. But she has not stood alone. She has been the centre of a group of women whose names will always be associated with our cause in this locality. Elizabeth K. Churchill lived and died a faithful and successful worker. The Woman's Club in this city was her child; temperance, suffrage, and the interests of working-women were dear to her heart. She was independent in her convictions, and true to herself,

Digitized by Google

even when it compelled dissent from the attitude of trusted leaders and friends, but her work on the platform, in the press, and in society, made her life a tower of strength to the woman's rights cause and her death a lamentable loss. Another active leader in the work here, though not a speaker, who has passed on since my residence in Providence, was Susan B. P. Martin. I think those of us accustomed to act with her always respected Mrs. Martin's judgment and felt sure of her fidelity. What more can be said of any one than that?

It is difficult to speak publicly of one's friends while living. But no history of woman suffrage agitation in Rhode Island would be complete which did not place among those ever to be relied on, the names of Anna Garlin Spencer, Sarah E. H. Doyle, Anna E. Aldrich and Fanny P. Palmer. Mrs. Spencer moved from the State just as I came into it, but the influence of her logical mind was left behind her and the loss of her quick womanly tact has been keenly felt. Mrs. Doyle has long been chairman of the executive committee of the association, Mrs. Aldrich a safe and trusted counsellor, and Mrs. Palmer as member of the Providence school committee, and more recently as president of the Woman's Club, has rendered the cause eminent service.

If final victory seems farther off here than in some of the newer States, as it certainly does, that is only the greater reason for earnest, and ceaseless work. We know we are right, and be it short or long I am sure we have all enlisted for the war.

Always sincerely yours, FREDERIC A. HINCKLEY.

Below is the last utterance of Senator Anthony on this question. In writing to Susan B. Anthony, he said:

UNITED STATES SENATE CHAMBER, WASHINGTON, March 4, 1884.

MY DEAR COUSIN: I am honored by your invitation to address the National Woman Suffrage Association at the convention to be held in this city. I regret that it is not in my power to comply with your complimentary request. The enfranchisement of woman is one of those great reforms which will come with the progress of civilization, and when it comes those who witness it will wonder that it has been so long delayed. The main argument against it is that the women themselves do not desire it. Many men do not desire it, as is evidenced by their omission to exercise it, but they are not therefore deprived of it. I do not understand that you propose compulsory suffrage, although I am not sure that that would not be for the public advantage as applied to both sexes. A woman has a right to vote in a corporation of which she is a stockholder, and that she does not generally exercise that right is not an argument against the right itself. The progress that is making in the direction of your efforts is satisfactory and encouraging.

Faithfully yours, H. B. ANTHONY.

Senator Anthony was one of the ever-to-be-remembered nine senators who voted for woman suffrage on the floor of the United States Senate in 1866. He also made a most logical speech on our behalf and has ever since been true to our demands.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXXIV.

MAINE.

Women on School Committees—Elvira C. Thorndyke—Suffrage Society, 1868—Rockland—The Snow Sisters—Portland Meeting, 1870—John Neal—Judge Goddard—Colby University Open to Girls, August 12, 1871—Mrs. Clara Hapgood Nash Admitted to the Bar, October 26, 1872—Tax-payers Protest—Ann F. Greeley, 1872—March, 1872, Bill for Woman Suffrage Lost in the House, Passed in the Senate by Seven Votes—Miss Frank Charles, Register of Deeds—Judge Reddington—Mr. Randall's Motion—Moral Eminence of Maine—Convention in Granite Hall, Augusta, January, 1873, Hon. Joshua Nye, President—Delia A. Curtis—Opinions of the Supreme Court in Regard to Women Holding Offices—Governor Dingley's Message, 1875—Convention, Representatives Hall, Portland, Judge Kingsbury, President, February 12, 1876.

THE first movement in Maine, in 1868, turned on the question of women being eligible on school committees. Here, as in Vermont, the men inaugurated the movement. The following letter, from the *Portland Press*, gives the iniative steps:

HIRAM, March 15, 1868.

MR. EDITOR: A statement is going the rounds of the press that the Democrats of Hiram supported a lady for a member of the school committee. I am unwilling that any person or party shall be ridiculed or censured for an act of which I was the instigator, and for which I am chiefly responsible. I am in favor of electing ladies to that office, and accordingly voted for one, without her knowledge or consent; several Democrats as well as Republicans voted with me. I have reason to believe that scores of Democrats voted for the able and popular candidate of the Republicans (Dr. William H. Smith), and but for my peculiar notion I should have voted for him myself, as I always vote with the Republican party. I am in favor, however, of laying aside politics in voting for school committees, and the question of capability should outweigh the question of sex. A few years ago we had a large number of boy schoolmasters, but agents are learning to appreciate teachers of tact, experience and natural qualifications, as well as book-knowledge. Of eleven schools under the care of the writer the past year, but one had a male teacher, and by turning to the reports I find that of forty-nine schools in Hiram during the past two years, forty-two were taught by ladies. Four of these teachers of the past year have taught respectively twenty, twenty-one, twenty-three and thirty schools. I put the question, why should a lady who has taught thirty schools be considered less suita-

ble for the office of school committee than the undersigned, who has taught but two, or scores of men who never taught school at all? Slowly and with hesitation over the ice of prejudice comes that unreasonable reason—"*O, 'cause.*" But regardless of pants or crinoline, the question remains unanswered and unanswerable. It is not deemed improper for the ladies of Hiram to go with their husbands to the town-house to a cattle show and fair, and serve as committees on butter and cheese, but it is considered unreasonable for ladies to serve as superintendents of school committees.

General Washington gave a lieutenant's commission to a woman for her skill and bravery in manning a battery at the battle of Monmouth. He also granted her half-pay during life. It is stated in "Lincoln's Lives of the Presidents" that "she wore an epaulette, and everybody called her Captain Molly." And yet I do not read in history that General Washington was ever impeached. Females have more and better influence than males, and under their instruction our schools have been improving for some years. There is less kicking and cudgeling, and more attention is given to that best of all rules, "The Golden Rule." If they are more efficient as teachers is it not fair to presume that they would excel as committees? Very respectfully yours,

LLEWELLYN A. WADSWORTH.

The editor of the *Press* adds to the above his own endorsement, in these words:

We are pleased to have Mr. Wadsworth's explanation of the reform movement in Hiram, which we had been misled into crediting to the Democrats. * * * Go on, Mr. Wadsworth, you have our best wishes. There is nothing in the way of the general adoption of your ideas but a lot of antiquated and obsolete notions, sustained by the laughter of fools.

The same year we have the report of the first suffrage society in that State, which seems to place Maine in the van of her New England sisters, notwithstanding the great darkness our correspondent deplores:

DEAR REVOLUTION: A society has just been organized here called the Equal Rights Association of Rockland. It bids fair to live, although it requires all the courage of heroic souls to contend against the darkness that envelopes the people. But the foundation is laid, and many noble women are catching the inspiration of the hour. When we are fully under way, we shall send you a copy of our preamble and resolutions.

ELVIRA C. THORNDYKE, *Cor. Sec'y.*

The Hon. John Neal, who was foremost in all good work in Maine, in a letter to *The Revolution*, describes the first meeting called in Portland, in May, 1870, to consider the subject of suffrage for woman. He says:

DEAR REVOLUTION: According to my promise, I sent an advertisement to all three of our daily papers last Saturday, in substance like the following, though somewhat varied in language:

Digitized by Google

ELEVATION OF WOMAN.—All who favor Woman Suffrage, the Sixteenth Amendment, and the restoration of woman to her "natural and inalienable rights," are wanted for consultation at the audience room of the Portland Institute and Public Library, on Wednesday evening next, at half-past seven o'clock. Per order

JOHN NEAL.

The weather was unfavorable; nevertheless, the small room, holding from sixty to seventy-five, to which the well-disposed were invited for consultation and organization, was crowded so that near the close not a seat could be had; and crowded, too, with educated and intelligent women, and brave, thoughtful men, so far as one might judge by appearances, and about in equal proportions. Among the latter were Mr. Talbot, United States district-attorney, a good lawyer and a self-convinced fellow laborer, so far as suffrage is concerned; but rather unwilling to go further at present, lest if a woman should be sent to the legislature (against her will, of course!) she might neglect her family, or be obliged to take her husband with her, to keep her out of mischief; just as if Portland, with 35,000 inhabitants and four representatives, would not be likely to find *two* unmarried women or widows, or married women not disqualified by matrimonial incumbrances or liabilities, to represent the sex; or lest, if she should get into the post-office, being by nature so curious and inquisitive, she might be found peeping—as if the chief distinction between superior and inferior minds was not this very disposition to inquire and investigate; as if, indeed, that which distinguishes the barbarous from the civilized, were not this very inquisitiveness and curiosity; the savage being satisfied with himself and averse to inquiry; the civilized ever on the alert, in proportion to his intelligence, and, like the Athenians, always on the look-out for some "new thing."

And then, too, we had Judge Goddard, of the Superior Court, one of our boldest and clearest thinkers, who could not be persuaded to take a part in the discussion, though declaring himself entirely opposed to the movement. And yet, he is the very man who, at a Republican convention several years ago, offered a resolution in favor of impartial suffrage, only to find himself in a minority of two; but persevered nevertheless, year after year, until the very same resolution, word for word, was unanimously adopted by another Republican convention! Of course, Judge Goddard will not be likely to shrink from giving his reasons hereafter, if the movement should propagate itself, as it certainly will.

We had also for consideration a synopsis of what deserves to be called most emphatically "The Maine Law," in relation to married women, prepared by Mr. Drummond, our late speaker and formerly attorney-general, and one of our best lawyers, where it was demonstrated, both by enactments and adjudications, running from March, 1844, to February, 1866, that a married woman—to say nothing of widows and spinsters—has little to complain of in our State, her legal rights being far ahead of the age, and not only acknowledged, but enforced; she being mistress of herself and of her earnings, and allowed to trade for herself, while "her contracts for any lawful purpose are made valid and binding, and to be enforced, as if she were sole agent of her property, but she cannot be arrested."

Then followed Mr. S. B. Beckett, just returned from a trip to the Holy Land, who testified, among other things, that he had seen women both in London and Ireland who knew "how to keep a hotel," which is reckoned among men as the highest earthly qualification—and proved it by managing some of the largest and best in the world.

And then Mr. Charles Jose, late one of our aldermen, who, half in earnest and half in jest, took t'other side of the question, urging, first, that this was a political movement—as if that were any objection, supposing it true; our whole system of government being a political movement, and that, by which we trampled out the last great rebellion, another, both parties and all parties coöperating in the work; next, that women did not ask for suffrage—it was the men who asked for it, in their names; that there were no complaints and no petitions from women! As if petitions had not gone up and complaints, too, by thousands, from all parts of the country, from school-teachers and office clerks and others, as well as from the women at large, both over sea and here.

But enough. The meeting stands adjourned for a week. Probably no organization will be attempted, lest it might serve to check free discussion. J. N.

May 5, 1870.

Mr. W. W. McCann wrote to the *Woman's Journal* of this suffrage meeting in Portland, in 1870:

Judge Howe's voice, when he addressed the jury of Wyoming as "Ladies and Gentlemen of the Grand Jury," fell upon the ears of that crowded court-room as a strange and unusual sound. Equally strange and impracticable seemed the call for a "woman suffrage meeting," at the city building, to the conservative citizens of Portland. However, notwithstanding the suspicion and prejudice with which this movement is regarded, quite a large and highly respectable audience assembled at an early hour to witness the new and wonderful phenomenon of a meeting to aid in giving the ballot to woman.

Hon. John Neal, who issued the call for the meeting, was the first to speak. He reviewed the history of this movement, both in this country and in England. He gave some entertaining reminiscences of his acquaintance with John Stuart Mill forty years ago. Mr. Mill was not then in favor of universal suffrage; he advocated the enfranchisement of the male sex only. Mr. Neal claimed the right for women also. He was happy to learn that since then Mr. Mill has thrown all the weight of his influence and his masterly intellect in favor of universal suffrage. He then entered into an elaborate discussion of some of the objections brought against woman suffrage, and, much to the surprise of many present, showed that the rights which women demand are just and reasonable, and ought to be granted. John M. Todd remarked that he was not so much impressed by the logical arguments in favor of suffrage as by the shallow and baseless arguments of the opposition. The friends of woman suffrage are becoming active and earnest in their efforts, and discussion is freely going on through the daily papers.

Digitized by Google

To-day, the *Eastern Argus*, a leading Democratic organ of this city, denounces this movement as the most "damnable heresy of this generation." We venture the prediction that its friends, if true to the progressive tendencies of the day, will realize the consummation of their cherished heresy in the proposed sixteenth amendment, which will abolish all distinction of class and sex.

On August 12, 1871, the announcement that Colby University would be opened to girls gave general satisfaction to the women of Maine. A correspondent says:

Hereafter young women will be admitted to this institution on "precisely the same terms as young men." They may take the regular course, or such a course as they may select, taking at least two studies each term. They will room and board in families in the village, and simply attend the required exercises at the college. The next examination for entrance will be on Wednesday, August 30. One young lady has already signified her purpose to enter the regular course. Four New England colleges are now open to women—Bates, at Lewiston; Colby, at Waterville, Me.; Vermont University, at Burlington, Vt., and Wesleyan, at Middletown, Conn. Let's have no more women's colleges established, for the next decade will make them unnecessary, as by that time all the colleges of the country will be opened to them.

October 26, 1872, another advance step was heralded abroad:

On motion of the Hon. James S. Milliken, Mrs. Clara Hapgood Nash, of Columbia Falls, was formally admitted to the bar as an attorney-at-law. During the session of the court in the forenoon, Mrs. Nash had presented herself before the examining committee, Messrs. Granger, Milliken and Walker, and had passed a more than commonly creditable examination. After the opening of the court in the afternoon, Mr. Milliken arose and said: "May it please the court, I hold in my hand papers showing that Mrs. Hapgood Nash, of Columbia Falls, has passed the committee appointed by the court to examine candidates for admission to the bar as attorneys-at-law and has paid to the county treasurer the duty required by the statute; and I now move the court that she be admitted to this bar as an attorney-at-law. In making the motion I am not unaware that this is a novel and unusual proceeding. It is the first instance in this county and this State, and, so far as I am aware, the first instance in New England, of the application of a woman to be formally admitted to the bar as a practitioner. But knowing Mrs. Nash to be a modest and refined lady, of literary and legal attainments, I feel safe in assuring Your Honor that by a course of honorable practice, and by her courteous intercourse with the members of the profession, she will do her full part to conquer any prejudice that may now exist against the idea of women being admitted as attorneys at law." Judge Barrows, after examining the papers handed to him, said: "I am not aware of anything in the constitution or laws of this State prohibiting the admission of a woman, possessing the proper qualifications, to the practice of the law. I have no sympathy with that feeling or prejudice which would exclude women

from any of the occupations of life for which they may be qualified. The papers put into my hands show that Mrs. Nash has received the unanimous approval of the examining committee, as possessing the qualifications requisite for an acceptable attorney, and that she has paid the legal duty to the county treasurer, and I direct that she be admitted."

On May 10, 1873, the trustees of the Industrial School for Girls issued the following appeal to the people of the State:

The undersigned, trustees of the Maine Industrial School for Girls, hereby earnestly appeal to the generosity of the State, to the rich and poor alike, for aid to this important movement. Our call is to mothers and fathers blessed with virtuous and obedient children; to those who have suffered by the waywardness of some beloved daughter; and to all who would gladly see the neglected, exposed and erring girls in our midst reclaimed. For six years has this subject been agitated in the State and presented to the consideration of several legislatures; and during that time the objects, plans and practical workings of such an institution, have become familiar to the public mind. The project is now so near consummation that by prompt and liberal response to this appeal, the school can be in active operation by the first of July next.

By the terms of the resolution of the legislature granting State aid of five thousand dollars, the sum of twenty thousand dollars must first be secured from other sources. Of this, five thousand at least has been contributed by two generous ladies in Hallowell. For the balance the trustees confidentially look to the citizens of the whole State as equally to be benefited. Let them send their contributions, whether large or small, freely and at once, to either of the undersigned and the receipt of the same shall be duly acknowledged.*

Some of the women tax-payers † in Ellsworth, Maine, sent the following protest to the assessors of that city:

We the undersigned residents of the city of Ellsworth, believing in the declaration of our forefathers, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and that "taxation without representation is tyranny," beg leave to protest against being taxed for support of laws that we have no voice in making. By taxing us you class us with aliens and minors, the only males who are taxed and not allowed to vote, you make us the political inferiors of the most ignorant foreigners, negroes, and men who have not intellect enough to learn to write their names, or to read the vote given them. Our property is at the disposal of men who have not the ability to accumulate a dollar's worth and who pay only a poll-tax. We therefore protest against being taxed until we are allowed the rights of citizens.

---

* Signed: *President*, Benj. Kingsbury, Portland; *Secretary*, E. R. French, S. Chesterville; *Treasurer*, William Deering Portland; *ex officio*, Gov. Sidney Perham, Secretary of State Geo. G. Stacy, Superintendent of Schools Warren Johnson; John B. Nealley, S. Berwick; Nelson Dingley, jr., Lewiston; J. S. Wheelright, Bangor; H. K. Baker, Hallowell; Mrs. C. A. L. Sampson, Bath; Mrs. James Fernald, Portland.

† Ann F. Greely, Sarah Jarvis, C. B. Grant, E. E. Tinker, A. D. Hight, M. J. Brooks, C. W. Jarvis, E. B. Jarvis, Rebecca M. Avery.

AUGUSTA, March 1, 1872.

EDITORS WOMAN'S JOURNAL: I have never seen a letter in the *Woman's Journal* written from Augusta, the capital of Maine, and as some things have transpired lately which might interest your readers, I take the liberty of writing a few lines. The bill for woman suffrage was defeated in the House, fifty-two to forty-one. In the Senate the vote was fifteen in favor to eight against. I think the smallness of the vote was owing to the indifference of some of the members and the determination of a few to kill the bill. Some politicians are afraid of this innovation just now, lest the Republican party be more disrupted than it already is. Day after day, when the session was drawing to a close, women went to the statehouse expecting to hear the question debated. Wednesday every available place was filled with educated women. The day was spent—if I should say how, my criticism might be too severe. Gentlemen from Thomaston, Biddeford, Burlington and Waldoborough had the floor most of the time during the afternoon. In the evening, while those same women and some of the members of the legislature were attending a concert, the bill was taken up and voted upon, *without any discussion whatever*. Now, I submit to any fair-minded person if this was right. I have listened to discussions upon that floor this winter for which I should have hung my head in shame had they been conducted by women. The whole country, from Maine to California, calls loudly for better legislation—for morality in politics.

A member of the House said to me yesterday, that he thought that some of the members from the rural districts were not sufficiently enlightened upon the question of woman suffrage, and the bill ought to have been thoroughly discussed. Yes, and perhaps treated with respect by its friends. I saw the member from Calais while a vote was being taken. Standing in his seat, with his hand stretched toward the rear of the House, where it is generally supposed that members sit who are a little slow in voting at the beck of politicians, he said: "*Yes* is the way to vote, gentlemen! Yes! Yes!" When women have such politicians for champions equal suffrage is secured. But do we want such men? The member from Calais voted against woman's right of suffrage. He is said to be an ambitious aspirant in the fifth congressional district. See to it, women of the fifth district, that you do not have him as an opponent of equal rights in congress. There is a throne behind a throne. Let woman be *regal* in the background, where she must stand for the present, in Maine.

But I am happy and proud to state that some very high-minded men, and some of the best legislators in the House, did vote for the bill, viz.: Brown of Bangor, Judge Titcomb of Augusta, General Perry of Oxford, Porter of Burlington, Labroke of Foxcroft, and many others; in the Senate, the president and fourteen others, the real bone and marrow of the Senate, voted for the bill. The signs of the times are good. The watchman of the night discerns the morning light in the broad eastern horizon.

[Signed:] PATIENCE COMMONSENSE.

The *Portland Press*, in a summary of progress in Maine for 1873, says:

Digitized by Google

Women certainly have no reason to complain of the year's dealings with them, for they have been recognized in many ways which indicate the gradual breaking down of the prejudices that have hitherto given them a position of *quasi* subjection. Mrs. Mary D. Welcome has been licensed to preach by the Methodists; Mrs. Fannie U. Roberts of Kittery has been commissioned by the governor to solemnize marriages; Clara H. Nash, of the famous law firm of F. C. & C. H. Nash, of Columbia Falls, has argued a case before a jury in the Supreme Court; Miss Mary C. Lowe of Colby University has taken a college prize for declamation. They are the first Maine women who have ever enjoyed honors of the kind. Miss Cameron spoke, too, at the last Congregational conference, and Miss Frank Charles was appointed register of deeds in Oxford county.

It is further to be noted that the legislature voted as follows on the question of giving the ballot to women: Senate—14 yeas, 14 nays: House—62 yeas, 69 nays. Women are rapidly obtaining a recognized position in our colleges. There are now five young women at Colby, three at Bates, and three at the Agricultural College—eleven in all. Bates has already graduated two. In the latter college a scholarship for the benefit of women has been endowed by Judge Reddington. Finally, the first Woman Suffrage Association ever formed in Maine held its first meeting at Augusta last January, and was a great success. Carmel, Monroe, Etna and some other towns have elected women superintendents of schools, but this has been done in other years. For a little movement in the right direction we must credit Messrs. Amos, Abbott & Co., woolen manufacturers of Dexter, who divide ten per cent. of their profits with their operatives.

Clara H. Nash, the lady who, in partnership with her husband, has recently entered upon the practice of law in Maine, says:

Scarcely a day passes but something occurs in our office to rouse my indignation afresh by reminding me of the utter insignificance with which the law, in its every department, regards woman, and its utter disregard of her rights as an individual. Would that women might feel this truth; then, indeed, would their enfranchisement be speedy.

In the *Woman's Journal* of January 1, 1873, we find the following call:

The people of Maine who believe in the extension of the elective franchise to women as a beneficent power for the promotion of the virtues and the correction of the evils of society, and all who believe in the principles of equal justice, equal liberty and equal opportunity, upon which republican institutions are founded, and have faith in the triumph of intelligence and reason over custom and prejudice, are invited to meet at Granite Hall, in the city of Augusta, on Wednesday, January 29, 1873, for the purpose of organizing a State Woman Suffrage Association, and inaugurating such measures for the advancement of the cause as the wisdom of the convention may suggest.*

* Signed by John Neal, S. T. Pickard, Mrs. Oliver Dennet, Mrs. Eleanor Neal, Portland; J. J. Eveleth, mayor, Joshua Nye, Chandler Beal, William H. Libbey, George W. Quinby, William P. White-

Digitized by Google

The *Portland Press*, in a leading editorial on the "Moral Eminence of Maine," says:

Maine has been first in many things. She has taught the world how to struggle with intemperance, and pilgrims come hither from all quarters of the earth to learn the theory and practice of prohibition. She was among the first to practically abolish capital punishment and to give married women their rights in respect to property. She is, perhaps, nearer giving them political rights, also, than any of her sister commonwealths. If Maine should be first among the States to give suffrage to women, she would do more for temperance than a hundred prohibitory laws, and more for civilization and progress than Massachusetts did when she threw the tea into Boston harbor in 1773, or when she sent the first regiment to the relief of Washington in 1861.

The leaders of the temperance reform in Maine are fully alive to the necessity of woman suffrage as a means to that end. At the meeting of the State Temperance Association of Maine, in Augusta, recently, Mr. Randall said that "as the woman suffrage convention has adjourned over this afternoon in order to attend the temperance meeting, he would move that when we adjourn it be to Thursday morning, as the work at both conventions is intimately connected. If the women of Maine went to the ballot-box, we should have officers to enforce the law." Mr. Randall's motion was carried, and the temperance convention adjourned.

The Woman Suffrage Association assembled Wednesday, January 29, in Granite Hall, Augusta. There was a very large attendance, a considerable number of those present being members of the legislature. Hon. Joshua Nye presided. He made a few remarks relating to the removal of political disabilities from women, and introduced Mrs. Agnes A. Houghton of Bath, who spoke on the "Turning of the Tide," contending that woman should be elevated socially, politically and morally, enjoying the same rights as man. She was followed by Judge Benjamin Kingsbury, jr., of Portland, who declared himself unequivocally in favor of giving woman the right to vote, and who trusted that she would be accorded this right by the present legislature. More than 1,000 persons were in the audience, and great en-

---

house, General Selden Conner, H. H. Hamlen, H. S. Osgood, Mrs. C. A. Quinby, Mrs. W. K. Lancey, Mrs. D. M. Waitt, Mrs. William B. Lapham, Mrs. S. M. Barton, Augusta; Mary A. Ross and fifty others; Rev. W. L. Brown, Mrs. E. A. Dickerson, Mrs. W. H. Burrill, Mrs. N. Abbott, Mrs. Thomas N. Marshall, Miss A. A. Hicks, Belfast; John D. Hopkins, Rev. William H. Savary, C. J. Peck, mayor, A. E. Drinkwater, Mrs. Ann F. Greely, Ellsworth; Mrs. A. H. Savary and twenty others; Mrs. M. C. Crossman, Mrs. S. D. Morison, Mrs. J. Tillson, Mrs. Sarah J. Prentiss, Mrs. Amos Pickard, Bangor; Miss M. Phillips and twelve others; Rev. John W. Hinds, Lewiston; Rev. T. P. Adams, Bowdoinham; A. H. Sweetser and twenty others, Rockland; Rev. W. H. Bolster, Wiscasset; W. T. C. Runnels, Searsport; Rev. M. V. B. Stinson, Kittery; John U. Hubbard, Alfred Winslow, West Waterville; Mrs. M. S. Philbrick, Skowhegan; Mrs. Simeon Conner, Fairfield; George Gifford, Mrs. Mary W. Southwick, H. M. N. Bush, M. A. Bush, A. E. Prescott, Vassalboro; A. R. Dunham and fourteen others; R. C. Caldwell and eight others, Gardiner; Albert Crosby, Mrs. S. G. Crosby, Albion; Noah F. Norton, Mercy G. Norton, Penobscot.

thusiasm prevailed. The morning session was devoted to business and the election of officers.* In order not to conflict with a meeting of the State Temperance Association, no afternoon session was held, and, in return, the State Temperance Society gave up its evening meeting to enable its members to attend the suffrage convention.

Speeches were made by Henry B. Blackwell of Boston, Rev. Ellen Gustin of Mansfield, Mary Eastman of Lowell, and others. Resolutions were passed pledging the association not to cease its efforts until the unjust discrimination with regard to voting is swept away; that in the election of president, and of all officers where the qualifications of voters are not prescribed by the State constitution, the experiment should be tried of allowing women to vote; that in view of the large amount of money which has been expended in Maine for the exclusive benefit of the Boys' Industrial School during the past twenty years, it is the prayer of the ladies of Maine that the present legislature vote the sum asked for the establishment of an Industrial School for girls.

In 1874 we find notices of other onward steps:

EDITORS JOURNAL: Woman's cause works slowly here, though in one respect we have been successful. Our county school-superintendent is a lady. She had a large majority over our other candidate, and over two gentlemen, and she is decidedly "the right person in the right place." She is a graduate from the normal school, the mother of four children, a widow for some six years past, and a lady. What more can we ask, unless, indeed, it be for a very conscientious idea of duty? That, too, she has, and also energy, with which she carries it out. The sterner sex admit that women are competent to hold office. But some say we are not intelligent enough to vote. What an appalling amount of wisdom they show in this idea! It would be "unwomanly" in us to suggest such a word as inconsistency. Fraternally, M. J. M.

Cairo, Me., April, 1874.

In Searsport a woman was elected one of the two school-superintendents of the town. The following advertisement appears in the local newspaper:

SEARSPORT SCHOOL NOTICE.—The superintending school-committee of Searsport will meet to examine teachers at the town library, April 17 and May 1, 1874, at 1 o'clock P. M.

DELIA A. CURTIS,
JOHN NICHOLS,
S. S. Com. of Searsport.

---

* *President*, Benjamin Kingsbury of Portland; *Secretary*, Miss Addie Quimby of Augusta; *Treasurer*, Mrs. W. K. Lancey of Augusta. Among the vice-presidents are the Hon. S. F. Hersey of Bangor, and John Neal of Portland. An Executive Committee was elected, which included John P. Whitehouse, Hon. Joshua Nye, Neal Dow, jr., and other leading citizens.

Digitized by Google

Teachers will be expected to discountenance the use of tobacco and intoxicating liquors, and to use their best endeavors to impress on the minds of the children and youth committed to their care and instruction a proper understanding of the evil tendency of such habits; and no teacher need apply for a certificate to teach in this town, the ensuing year, who uses either. DELIA A. CURTIS.

DEAR JOURNAL: Aroostook, though occupying the extreme northeastern portion of our good State of Maine, and still in the blush of youth, is not behind her sister counties in recognition of woman's fitness for office. The returns of town elections, so far as I have yet seen, give three towns in the county which have elected ladies* to serve as members of the school committee. L. J. Y. W.

Houlton, Maine.

In the autumn of 1874 the governor and council requested the opinion of the Supreme Judicial Court on the following questions:

First—Under the constitution and laws of this State, can a woman, if duly appointed and qualified as a justice of the peace, legally perform all acts pertaining to that office?

Second—Would it be competent for the legislature to authorize the appointment of a married woman to the office of justice of the peace; or to administer oaths, take acknowledgment of deeds or solemnize marriages, so that the same may be legal and valid?

The following responses to these inquiries were received by the governor: the opinion of the court, drawn by Chief-Justice Appleton, and concurred in by Justices Cutting, Peters, Danforth and Virgin; a dissenting opinion from Justices Walton and Barrows and one from Justice Dickerson. The opinion of the court is given below:

To the questions proposed we have the honor to answer as follows:

Whether it is expedient that women should hold the office of justice of the peace is not an inquiry proposed for our consideration. It is whether, under the existing constitution, they can be appointed to such office, and can legally discharge its duties.

By the constitution of Massachusetts, of which we formerly constituted a portion, the entire political power of that commonwealth was vested under certain conditions, in its male inhabitants of a prescribed age. They alone, and in the exclusion of the other sex, as determined by its highest court of law, could exercise the judicial function as existing and established by that instrument.

By the act relating to the separation of the district of Maine from Massachusetts, the authority to determine upon the question of separation, and to elect delegates to meet and form a constitution was conferred upon the "inhabitants of the several towns, districts and plantations in the district of Maine qualified to vote for governor or senators," thus excluding the female sex from all participation in the formation of the constitution, and in the organization of the government under it. Whether the constitution should or should not be adopted, was especially, by the organic law of its existence, submitted to the vote of the male inhabitants of the State.

It thus appears that the constitution of the State was the work of its male citizens. It was ordained, established, and ratified by them, and by them alone; but by the power of government was divided into three distinct departments: legislative, executive and judicial. By article VI., section 4, justices of the peace are recognized as judicial officers.

* Miss Louisa Coffin, Dalton; Miss Annie Lincoln, Mapleton; Miss Ada DeLaite, Littleton.

By the constitution, the whole political power of the State is vested in its male citizens. Whenever in any of its provisions, reference is made to sex, it is to duties to be done and performed by male members of the community. Nothing in the language of the constitution or in the debates of the convention by which it was formed, indicates any purpose whatever of any surrender of political power by those who had previously enjoyed it or a transfer of the same to those who had never possessed it. Had any such design then existed, we cannot doubt that it would have been made manifest in appropriate language. But such intention is nowhere disclosed. Having regard then, to the rules of the common law as to the rights of women, married and unmarried, as then existing—to the history of the past—to the universal and unbroken practical construction given to the constitution of this State and to that of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts upon which that of this State was modeled, we are led to the inevitable conclusion that it was never in the contemplation or intention of those framing our constitution that the offices thereby created should be filled by those who could take no part in its original formation, and to whom no political power was intrusted for the organization of the government then about to be established under its provisions, or for its continued existence and preservation when established.

The same process of reasoning which would sanction the conferring judicial power on women under the constitution would authorize the giving them executive power by making them sheriffs and major-generals. But while the offices enacted by the constitution are to be filled exclusively by the male members of the State, we have no doubt that the legislature may create new ministerial offices not enumerated therein, and if it deem expedient, may authorize the performance of the duties of the offices so created by persons of either sex.

To the *first* question proposed, we answer in the negative.

To the *second*, we answer that it is competent for the legislature to authorize the appointment of married or unmarried women to administer oaths, take acknowledgment of deeds or solemnize marriages, so that the same shall be legal and valid.

JOHN APPLETON, JOHN A. PETERS,
JONAS CUTTING, WM. WIRT VIRGIN,
CHARLES DANFORTH.

The dissenting opinion was as follows:

We, the undersigned, Justices of the Supreme Judicial Court, concur in so much of the foregoing opinion as holds that it is competent for the legislature to authorize the appointment of women to administer oaths, take the acknowledgment of deeds and solemnize marriages. But we do not concur in the conclusion that it is not equally competent for the legislature to authorize the appointment of women to act as justices of the peace.

The legislature is authorized to enact any law which it deems reasonable and proper, provided it is not repugnant to the constitution of this State, nor to that of the United States. A law authorizing the appointment of women to act as justices of the peace would not, in our judgment, be repugnant to either. We fail to find a single word, or sentence, or clause of a sentence, which, fairly construed, either expressly or impliedly forbids the passage of such a law. So far as the office of justice of the peace is concerned, there is not so much as a masculine pronoun to hang an objection upon.

It is true that the right to vote is limited to males. But the right to vote and the right to hold office are distinct matters. Either may exist without the other. And it may be true that the framers of the constitution did not contemplate—did not affirmatively intend—that women should hold office. But it by no means follows that they intended the contrary. The truth probably is that they had no intention one way or the other; that the matter was not even thought of. And it will be noticed that the unconstitutionality of such a law is made to rest, not on any expressed intention of the framers of the constitution that women should not hold office, but upon a presumed absence of intention that they should.

Digitized by Google

This seems to us a dangerous doctrine. It is nothing less than holding that the legislature cannot enact a law unless it appears affirmatively that the framers of the constitution intended that such a law should be enacted. We cannot concur in such a doctrine. It would put a stop to all progress. We understand the correct rule to be the reverse of that; namely, that the legislature may enact any law they may think proper, unless it appears affirmatively that the framers of the constitution intended that such a law should not be passed. And the best and only safe rule for ascertaining the intention of the makers of any written law, is to abide by the language which they have used. And this is especially true of written constitutions; for in preparing such instruments it is but reasonable to presume that every word has been carefully weighed, and that none is inserted and none omitted without a design for so doing. Taking this rule for our guide we can find nothing in the constitution of the United States, or of this State, forbidding the passage of a law authorizing the appointment of women to act as justices of the peace. We think such a law would be valid.

C. W. WALTON,
WM. G. BARROWS.

The right of women to hold office was affirmed in the message of Governor Dingley, January, 1875:

In response to the questions propounded by the governor and council, a majority of the justices of the Supreme Court have given an opinion that, under the constitution of Maine, women cannot act as justices of the peace, nor hold any other office mentioned in that instrument; but that it is competent for the legislature to authorize persons of either sex to hold any ministerial office created by statute. As there can be no valid objection to, but on the contrary great convenience in, having women who may be acting as clerks in public or private offices authorized to administer oaths and take acknowledgment of deeds, I recommend the passage of an act providing for the appointment of persons of either sex, to perform such official duties. Indeed, if further legislation be necessary to establish that principle, I suggest the justice and expediency of an enabling act recognizing the eligibility of women to office in the same manner as men; for I know of no sufficient reason why a woman, otherwise qualified, should be excluded from any position adapted to her tastes and acquirements, which the people may desire she should fill.

The legislature passed the bill recommended by the governor.

In 1875 the Constitutional Committee, by a vote of six to two, defeated the proposition to so amend the constitution as to make women electors under the same regulations and restrictions as men.

The Maine Woman Suffrage Association held its third annual meeting at Augusta on January 12, 1876, in the hall of the House of Representatives, the use of which had been courteously extended to the association. The hall and galleries were crowded in every part with an intelligent audience, whose close attention through all the sessions showed an earnest interest in the cause.

The meeting was called to order by Judge Kingsbury of Portland, president of the association.* Prayer was offered by Miss Angell of Canton,

* The following officers were elected: *President*, Hon. Benjamin Kingsbury of Portland; *Chairman Executive Committee*, Hon. Joshua Nye; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mr. C. A. Quinby, Augusta; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. W. D. Eaton, Dexter; *Treasurer*, Mrs. W. K. Lancey, Pittsfield.

N. Y. Judge Kingsbury made the introductory address. Addresses were also made by H. B. Blackwell, Miss Eastman and Lucy Stone, showing the right and need of women in politics, and the duty of law-makers to establish justice for them. It was especially urged that the centennial celebration would be only a mockery if the Fourth of July, 1876, finds this government still doing to women what the British government did to the colonists a hundred years ago. Rev. Mr. Gage of Lewiston urged the right of women to vote in the interest of civilization itself. In the perilous times upon which we have fallen in the great experiment of self-government, some new force is needed to check growing evils. The influence in the home is that which is needed in legislation, and it can only be had by the ballot in the hand of woman. Mrs. Quinby, from the Business Committee, reported a series of resolutions. After their adoption Mrs. Abba G. Woolson, in an earnest and forcible speech, claimed the right of women to vote, as the final application of the theory of the consent of the governed. She had personally noticed the good effects of the ballot conferred upon the women in Wyoming, and should be glad to have her native State of Maine lead in this matter, and give an illustration of the true republic. Miss Lorenza Haynes, who had been the day before ordained over the Universalist Church in Hallowell, followed with a speech of remarkable wit and brilliancy, to which no report can do justice.

A writer in the *Woman's Journal* about this time said:

During the early part of the session of our late legislature woman suffrage petitions were numerously signed by the leading men and women throughout the State receiving an earnest and respectful consideration from the people generally, even from those who were not quite ready to sign petitions. Consequently, it seemed an easy matter to get a bill before the legislature, and we were almost certain of a majority in one branch of the House, at least, especially as it was generally understood that our new governor favored the cause; and it is believed yet that Governor Dingley does sympathize with it, even though he failed to mention it in his otherwise admirable message. The petitions were duly presented and referred to a joint committee, where the matter was allowed to quietly drop.

It is neither riches, knowledge, nor culture that constitutes the electoral qualifications, but gender and a certain implied brute force. By this standard legislative bodies have been wont to judge the exigency of this mighty question. More influential than woman, though unacknowledged as such by the average legislator of States and nations, even the insignificant lobster finds earnest champions where woman's claims fail of recognition; which assertion the following incident will substantiate: Being present in the Representatives Hall in Augusta when the "lobster question" came up for discussion (the suffrage question was then struggling before the committee), I was struck by the air of earnestness that pervaded the entire House on that memorable occasion. And why not? It was a question that appealed directly to man's appetite, and there he is always interested. After the morning hour a dozen ready debators sprang to their

Digitized by Google

feet, eloquent in advocating the rights of this important member of the crustacean family. The discussion waxed into something like enthusiasm, when finally an old tar exclaimed with terrific violence: "Mr. Speaker, I insist upon it, this question must be considered. It is a great question; one before which all others will sink into insignificance; one of vastly more importance than any other that will come before this honorable body during this session!" DIRIGO.

In closing this chapter it is fitting to mention some of our faithful friends in Maine, whose names have not appeared in societies and conventions as leaders or speakers, but whose services in other ways have been highly appreciated.

Rockland is the home of Lucy and Lavinia Snow, who, from the organization of the first society in 1868, have never failed to send good words of cheer and liberal contributions to all our National conventions. Another branch of the worthy Snow family, from the town of Hamlin, has given us equally generous coädjutors in Mrs. Spofford and her noble sisters in Washington.

As early as 1857, Mrs. Anna Greeley and Miss Charlotte Hill of Ellsworth constituted themselves a conmittee to inaugurate a course of lyceum lectures in that town, taking the entire financial responsibility. Miss Hill was an excellent violinist and taught a large class of boys and girls, and also played at balls and parties, thus gaining a livelihood. Some of her patrons threatened that if she persisted in bringing such people * to that town and affiliated with them, they would no longer patronize her. "Very well" she replied, "I shall maintain my principles, and if you break up my classes I can go back to the sea-shore and dig clams for a living as I have done before." Tradition says the lecture course was a success. She continued her classes and the neighbors danced as ever to her music.

Gail Hamilton, who resides in Maine at least half her time, is one of the most brilliant and pungent American writers. In denouncing the follies and failures of her sex, her critical pen has indirectly aided the suffrage movement by arousing thought upon all phases of the question as to what are the rights and duties of woman, though she stoutly maintains that she is opposed to woman's enfranchisement.

In Portland there has always been a circle of noble men and women, steadfast friends alike of the anti-slavery, temperance and woman suffrage movements. The names of Mr. and Mrs. Oliver Dennett, Miss. Charlotte A. Thomas and Mrs. Ellen French

* Those invited were Wendell Philips, Harriet K. Hunt, Caroline H. Dall and Susan B. Anthony.

Digitized by Google

Foster are worthy of mention. That untiring reformer, the Hon. Neal Dow, has clearly seen and declared in the later years of his labors, that suffrage for women is the short path to the advancement of prohibition.

The Hon. Thomas B. Reed has done us great service in congress as leader of the Republican party in the House, and member of the Judiciary Committee. His report,* in 1884, on the submission of the sixteenth amendment has had an extended influence. It is an able argument, and as a keen piece of irony it is worthy the pen of a Dean Swift. In the Senate we have a fast friend in William P. Frye, who has always voted favorably in both houses on all questions regarding the interests of woman. In 1878, in presenting Miss Willard's petition of 30,000 for woman's right to vote on the temperance question, he made an able speech recommending the measure.†

And in closing, the name of Maine's venerable statesman, Hannibal Hamlin, so long honored by his State in a succession of official positions from year to year, must not be forgotten. As chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia in 1870 he presided at the first hearing of the National Woman Suffrage Association, listened with respect and courtesy, and at the close introduced the ladies to each member of the committee, and said "he had been deeply impressed by the arguments, and was almost persuaded to accept the new gospel of woman's equality." Mr. Hamlin's vote has always been favorable and we have no words of his recorded in the opposition.

Hon. James G. Blaine has generally maintained a dignified silence on the question. Thus far in his History, a reviewer says, "he has ignored the existence of woman"; but perhaps in his researches he has not yet reached the garden of Eden, nor taken cognizance of the part the daughters of Eve have played in the rise and fall of mighty nations.

Nevertheless in our prolonged struggle of half a century for equal rights for woman, we have found in every State the traditional ten righteous men necessary to save its people from destruction.

---

* Mr. Reed's report is published in full in our annual report of 1884, which can be obtained of Susan B. Anthony, Rochester, N. Y.

† See page 104.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXXV.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Nathaniel P. Rogers—First Organized Action, 1868—Concord Convention—William Lloyd Garrison's Letter—Rev. S. L. Blake Opposed—Rev. Mr. Sanborn in Favor—*Concord Monitor*—Armenia S. White—A Bill to Protect the Rights of Married Men—Minority and Majority Reports—Women too Ignorant to Vote—Republican State Convention—Women on School Committees—Voting at School-District Meetings—Mrs. White's Address—Mrs. Ricker on Prison Reform—Judicial Decision in Regard to Married Women, 1882—Letter from Senator Blair.

A STATE that could boast four such remarkable families as the Rogers, the Hutchinsons, the Fosters, and the Pillsburys, all radical, outspoken reformers, furnishes abundant reason for its prolonged battles with the natural conservatism of ordinary communities. Every inch of its soil except its mountain tops, where no man could raise a school-house for a meeting, has been overrun by the apostles of peace, temperance, anti-slavery, and woman's rights in succession.

To the early influence of Nathaniel P. Rogers and his revolutionary journal, *The Herald of Freedom*, we may trace the general awakening of the true men and women of that State to new ideas of individual liberty. But while some gladly accepted his words as harbingers of a new and better civilization, others resisted all innovations of their time-honored customs and opinions. And when the clarion voices of Foster and Pillsbury arraigned that State for its compromises with slavery, howling mobs answered their arguments with brickbats and curses; mobs that nothing could quell but the sweet voices of the Hutchinson family. Their peans of liberty, so readily accepted when set to music, were obstinately resisted when uttered by others, though in most eloquent speech. Thus with music, meetings and mobs, New Hampshire was at least awake and watching, and when the distant echoes of woman's uprising reverberated through her mountains she gave a ready response.

In 1868, simultaneously with other New England States, she felt the time had come to organize for action on the question of

Digitized by Google

suffrage for women. A call for a convention was issued to be held in Concord, December 22, 23, and signed by one hundred and twenty men and women,* some of the most honored and influential classes of all callings and professions. Nathaniel P. White, always ready to aid genuine reformatory movements, was the first to sign the call. As a member of the legislature he had helped to coin into law many of the liberal ideas sown broadcast in the early days† by the anti-slavery apostles. Galen Foster, a brother of Stephen, used his influence also as a member of the legislature, to vindicate the rights of women to civil and political equality. This first convention was held in Eagle Hall, Concord, with large and enthusiastic audiences. A long and interesting letter was read from William Lloyd Garrison:

BOSTON, December 21, 1868.

DEAR MRS. WHITE: I must lose the gratification of being present at the Woman Suffrage Convention at Concord and substitute an epistolary testimony for a speech from the platform.

The two conventions recently held in furtherance of the movement for universal and impartial suffrage—one in Boston, the other in Providence—were eminently successful in respect to numbers, intellectual ability, moral strength and unity of action; and their proceedings such as to challenge attention and elicit wide-spread commendation. I have no doubt that the convention in Concord will exhibit the same features, be animated by the same hopeful spirit and produce as cheering results.

The only criticism seemingly of a disparaging tone, I have seen, of the speeches made at the conventions alluded to, is, that there was nothing new advanced on the occasion; as though novelty were the main thing, and the reiteration of time-honored truths, with their latest application to the duties of the hour, were simply tedious! For one, I ask no more light upon the subject; nor am I so vain as to assume to be capable of throwing any additional light upon it. One drop of water is very like another, but it is the perpetual dropping that wears away the stone. The importunate widow had nothing fresh or new to present to the unjust judge,

* *Concord*, Nathaniel P. White, Mrs. Sarah Pillsbury, Rev. J. F. Lovering, P. B. Cogswell, Mrs. Eliza Morrill, Mrs. Louisa W. Wood, Col. James E. Larkin, Mrs. J. F. Lovering, Charles S. Piper, Mrs. Armenia S. White, Mrs. M. M. Smith, Mrs. F. E. Kittredge, Mrs. Sarah Piper, Mrs. Ira Abbott, Mrs. L. M. Bust, Dr. A. Morrill, Mrs. P. Ladd, Mrs. R. A. Smith, George W. Brown, Mr. and Mrs. J. V. Aldrich, Mr. and Mrs. M. B. Smith, Mrs. T. H. Brown, Mrs. R. Hatch, Mrs. J. L. Crawford, Mrs. Anna Dumas, Miss Harriet C. Edmunds, Miss Salina Stevens, Miss Mary A. Denning, Miss N. E. Fessender, Miss M. L. Noyes, Miss Clara Noyes, James H. Chase, Peter Sanborn; *Lancaster*, Rev. J. M. L. Babcock; *Rochester*, Mrs. Abby P. Ela; *Bradford*, Mrs. L. A. T. Lane, Miss M. J. Tappan; *Laconia*, Rev. J. L. Gorman, William M. Blair; *Manchester*, Dr. M. O. A. Hunt; *Plymouth*, Hon. D. R. Burnham; *Portsmouth*, Hon. A. W. Haven; *Canterbury*, Mr. and Mrs. D. M. Clough; *Lebanon*, A. M. Shaw; *Keene*, Col. and Mrs. Wilson; *Grafton*, Mr. and Mrs. Peter Kimball; *Northfield*, Mrs. D. E. Hill; *Franklin*, Rev. Wm. T. Savage; *Canaan*, William W. George; *Littleton*, R. D. Runneville.

† They had their influence in the church as well as the State, as the following item in *The Revolution*, July 16, 1868, shows: "The New Hampshire convention of Universalists, at their late anniversary, adopted unanimously a resolution in favor of woman's elevation to entire equality with man in every civil, political and religious right."

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1934 L

Digitized by Google

Armenia S. White

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

but by her persistent coming she wearied him into compliance with her petition. The end of the constant assertion of a right withheld is restitution and victory. The whole anti-slavery controversy was expressed and included in the Golden Rule, morally, and in the Declaration of Independence, politically; nor could anything new be added to these by the wisest, the most ingenious, or the most eloquent. "Line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little"; that is the essential method of reform. If there is nothing new to be said in favor of suffrage for women, is there anything new to be urged against it? But though the objections are exceedingly trite and shallow, it is still necessary to examine and refute them by arguments and illustrations none the less forcible because exhausted at an earlier period.

The first objection is positively one of the most urgent reasons for granting suffrage to women; for it is predicated on the concession of the superiority of woman over man in purity of purpose and excellence of character. Hence the cry is, that it will not only be descending, but degrading for her to appear at the polls. But, if government is absolutely necessary, and voting not wrong in practice, it is surely desirable that the admittedly purest and best in the nation should find no obstacle to their reaching the ballot-box. Nay, the way should be opened at once, by every consideration pertaining to the public welfare, the justice of legislation, the preservation of popular liberty. It is impossible for a portion of the people, to be wiser and more trustworthy than the whole people, or better qualified to decide what shall be the laws for the government of all. The more minds consulted, the more souls included, the more interests at stake, in determining the form and administration of government, the more of justice and humanity, of security and repose, will be the result. The exclusion of half the population from the polls, is not merely a gross injustice, but an immense loss of brain and conscience, in making up the public judgment. As a nation we have discarded absolutism, monarchy, and hereditary aristocracy; but we have not fully attained even to manhood suffrage. Men are proscribed on account of their complexion, women because of their sex. The entire body politic suffers form this proscription.

The second objection refutes the first; it is based on the alleged natural inferiority of woman to man, and the transition is thus quickly made for her, from a semi-angelic state, to that of a menial, having no rights that men are bound to respect beyond what they choose to allow. In the scale of political power, therefore, one male voter, however ignorant or depraved, outweighs all the women in America! For, no matter how intelligent, cultured, refined, wealthy, intellectually vigorous, or morally great, any of their number may be,—no matter what rank in literature, art, science, or medical knowledge and skill they may reach,—they are political nonentities, unrepresented, discarded, and left to such protection under the laws, as brute force and absolute usurpation may graciously condescend to give. Yet they are as freely taxed and held amendable to penal law as strictly as though they had their full share of representation in the legislative hall, on the bench, in the jury-box, and at the polls. This

Digitized by Google

cry of inferiority is not peculiar in the case of woman. It was the subterfuge and defiance of negro slavery. It has been raised in all ages by tyrants and usurpers against the toiling, over-burdened millions, seeking redress for their wrongs, and protection for their rights. It always indicates intense self-conceit, and supreme selfishness. It is at war with reason and common-sense, and is a bold denial of the oneness of the human race.

The third objection is, that women do not wish to vote. If this were true, it would not follow that they should not be enfranchised, and left free to determine the matter for themselves. It was confidently declared that the slaves at the south neither wished to be free, nor would they take their liberty if offered them by their masters. Had that assertion been true, it would have furnished no justification whatever, for making man the property of his fellow-man, or for leaving the slaves in their fetters. But it was not true. Nor is it true that women do not wish to vote. Tens of thousands are ready to go to the polls and assume their share of political responsibility, as soon as they shall be legally permitted to do so; and they are not the ignorant and degraded of their sex, but women remarkable for their intelligence and moral worth. The great mass will, ere long, be sufficiently enlightened to claim what belongs to them of right. I hope to be permitted to live to see the day when neither complexion nor sex shall be made a badge of degradation, but men and women shall enjoy the same rights and privileges, and possess the same means for their protection and defense.

Very faithfully yours, WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

Mrs. A. S. WHITE.

At the close of this convention a State association was formed with Mrs. Armenia S. White president.* This society has been unremitting in its efforts to rouse popular thought, holding annual conventions, scattering tracts, rolling up petitions, and addressing legislatures. Many of the best speakers, from time to time, from other States † have rendered valuable aid in keeping up the agitation.

---

* *President*, Mrs. Armenia S. White. *Vice-Presidents*, Rev. J. F. Lovering, Concord; Mrs. A. L. Thomas, Laconia; Ossian Ray, Lancaster; Mrs. S. Pillsbury, Concord; J. V. Aldrich, West Concord; Mrs. Mary Worcester, Nashua; Mrs. Mary Barker, Alton; Peter Kimball, Grafton; E. J. Durant, Lebanon; Mrs. Fannie V. Roberts, Dover; Miss A. C. Payson, Peterboro; Mrs. E. A. Bartlett, Kingston; Mr. Springfield, South Wolfboro; Galen Foster, Canterbury; Mrs. R. M. Miller, Manchester; Mrs. Nancy Gilman, Tilton; C. Ballou, North Weare; D. Burnham, Plymouth. *Executive Committee*, Nathaniel White, Mrs. E. C. Lovering, Col. J. E. Larkin, Concord; Mrs. J. Abby Ela, Rochester; Rev. Wm. T. Savage, Franklin; Mrs. Eliza Morrill, Mrs. Daniel Holden, West Concord; Miss Caroline Foster, Canterbury; P. B. Cogswell, Mrs. Louisa Wood, Mrs. M. M. Smith, Concord; Dr. M. V. A. Hunt, Manchester. *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. E. C. Lovering, Concord. *Corresponding Secretary*, Dr. J. Gallinger. *Treasurer*, Jas. H. Chase.

† Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Frederick Hinckley, Lucy Stone, Frances Ellen Harper, Dr. Sarah H. Hathaway, Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford, Rev. Mr. Connor, Rev. Ada C. Bowles, Emma Coe Still, Rev. Lorenza Haynes, Mary Grew, Mary A. Livermore, Elizabeth K. Churchill, Margaret W. Campbell, Anna Dickinson, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Rev. Olympia Brown, Lillie Devereux Blake, Elizabeth A. Meriwether, Elizabeth Lisle Saxon, Susan B. Anthony.

Digitized by Google

The opposition of a clergyman produced a sensation in Concord.

On last fast-day, 1871, Rev. S. L. Blake of the Congregational church in Concord, preached a sermon in which he came out against the woman's rights convention held there last January, bringing the stale charge of "free-love" against its advocates—a charge that always leaps to the lips of men of prurient imagination—with much similar clap-trap of the Fulton type. Rev. Mr. Sanborn of the Universalist church replied to him the next Sunday evening, an immense audience being in attendance, and completely disproved the baseless allegations of the reverend maligner, to the satisfaction of all. Rev. Mr. Blake has published his discourse in pamphlet form, repeating his disproved charges, whereupon Rev. J. F. Lovering of the Unitarian church came out with a reply, in which he characterized Mr. Blake's charges as "unmitigated falsehoods" and "an insult to every member of the convention," and demanded of the author to "unsay his words."

Brainard Cogswell, in his journal, the *Concord Monitor*, of July 2, 1870, published the following letter:

Petitions for woman's enfranchisement have been pouring into the New Hampshire legislature, until at last they have been referred to a special committee. On Thursday week this committee gave the petitioners a hearing; and on their invitation, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Mrs. Elizabeth K. Churchill and ourself went to Concord to give "the reasons why" women should have the ballot. The members of the legislature came out in force to hear, and our good, tried friends, Nathaniel and Armenia White, learning their intention in advance, opened the spacious Eagle Hall for their convenience, and that of the towns-people who wished to see and to hear. Warm as the evening was, the thermometer up in the nineties, the hall was packed, and great numbers went away that could not gain admittance. Rev. Mr. Blake, a Congregationalist minister of Concord, has done the cause good service by vilifying and abusing it, until he roused quite an interest. It was partly owing to his efforts that we had so grand an audience.

General Wilson, who twenty years ago was famed throughout New Hampshire for his eloquence and oratory, was chairman of the committee, and presided at the meeting, and very handsomely introduced the speakers. Mrs. Howe spoke with more pointed and pungent power than usual, dwelling on the deterioration of American womanhood, showing the cause, and suggesting the remedy. We have never been so impressed by her as on this occasion. Mrs. Churchill read a letter from Rev. Mr. Savage, a Congregationalist clergyman of the State, who advocates woman suffrage, and who, in a late ministerial gathering, took up the gauntlet thrown down by Mr. Blake, and defended the woman's cause and its advocates from the slanders of his brother minister.

The president of the New Hampshire association, in writing from Concord to the *Woman's Journal*, January 30, 1871, says:

Digitized by Google

Our second annual meeting was a grand success, if we count by money and numbers. The intense cold on Wednesday and Thursday made our audiences thinner than heretofore, but they were large in spite of the elements. Mrs. Churchill and Mrs. Emma Coe Still, who had never presented the subject here before, were well received. Rev. Dr. Savage of Franklin made an excellent address, and encouraged us by timely suggestions. Stephen S. Foster aroused us, as he always does, with his bold declarations. The resolutions adopted look toward future work, and embody the principles which move us to act.

Lucy Stone, in the *Woman's Journal* of June 14, 1871, says:

The Select Committee, Harry Bingham, chairman, to whom was referred a bill for the further protection of the rights of married men, reported the bill in a new draft as follows:

Marriages shall not hereafter render the husband liable for the debts contracted by his wife prior to their marriage: *Second section*—No marriage shall hereafter discharge the wife from liability to pay the debts contracted by her before such marriage, but she, and all property which she may hold in her own right, shall be held liable for the payment of all debts, whether contracted before or after marriage; in the same manner as if she continued sole and unmarried.

This report was signed by eight of the ten members of the committee. The minority, through Mr. Sprague of Swanzey, made a report recommending that the whole subject be postponed to the time when women in New Hampshire have the right to vote. Mr. Sprague moved that the minority report be substituted for the majority, but the motion was lost by an almost unanimous vote. The majority report was sustained in remarks by Messrs. Wadleigh of Milford and Cogswell of Gilman. The latter, hard pushed by an interrogatory concerning his social status, admitted that he was not married, but intended to be soon. The bill reported by the majority was then ordered to a second reading.

If this action should be sustained by the legislature, we can imagine some future suitor for a lady's hand telling her that he shall expect her duly to keep his house and his wardrobe in order, to prepare his meals, to entertain his visitors, to bear his children, and that she will be required by law to pay her own bills; that for this inestimable privilege she shall be called Mrs. John Snooks, and may, perhaps, have the honor of being written in the newspapers, and on her tombstone, as the relic of Mr. John Snooks. Could any woman withstand that?

The following statistics have been used by speakers in the opposition, to show that women are too ignorant to vote:

A decided sensation has been produced throughout the country by the publication in the third number of the "Transactions of the American Social Science Association" of statistics concerning the illiteracy of women in the United States. The subject has received very general discussion, and these are the conclusions reached:

1. That there is a large excess of female illiteracy. 2. That from 1850 to 1860 there was an increase of illiterate women to the extent of 53 per cent. in New Hampshire, 27 in Vermont, 24 in Massachusetts, 33 in Rhode Island, 16 in Connecticut, 37

Digitized by Google

in the District of Columbia, 33 in Wisconsin and 32 in Minnesota. 3. That this state of things is alarming, and ought to be remedied.

When the London *Saturday Review* raised the cry of alcoholic drunkenness among women, the conservative journals all over the world swelled the sound and confirmed the charges. Now that that story has run itself to death, a new assault is projected, and a general clamor concerning their illiteracy follows. If the charges are true, there is nothing very astonishing about them. The education of women has been considered a matter of secondary importance until very recently, and with our foreign population the education of girls has been almost wholly neglected. When the customs and usages of the world have made ignorance largely compulsory in women, it is somewhat inconsistent in men to go into spasms about the results.

January 17, 1874, at the Republican State convention, Mayor Briggs of Manchester, on taking the chair, made a speech, rehearsing the history of the party and laying out its programme for the future, closing as follows:

The Republican party has future duties. Its mission cannot end and its work should not, so long as any radical reform shall yet urge its demands in behalf of humanity. The civil service reform is eminent and important. In this regard the movement of the present administration is in the right direction, and yet it is only a first step of many which must ultimately be taken. To the people, not to a part of the people, belongs the sovereignty of this nation. Let them keep it. To this end great care should be taken to guard against the caucus system. Nothing should be more scrupulously avoided in the management of political parties. Anti-republican in spirit, it is sometimes exclusive in practice. The people have the same right to nominate that they have to elect their own officers. Why not? Ultimately, too, they will take that right, and for its own sake no party can afford to make itself the nursery of caucus power. The political machinery should be simplified, that nothing which mere politicians can desire shall stand between the people and their government. In a genuine republic, every act of the government should be but a practical expression of its subjects. All the subjects, too, should share equally the power of such expression. There should be no exclusion among intelligent, qualified classes. Involved in this principle is the idea of woman suffrage, the next great moral issue, in my judgment, which this country must meet, and a reform which no party can afford to despise. Indubitably right, as I believe it to be, I regard its success as inevitable, and that whatever party opposes it is as surely destined to defeat, as was the party which arrayed itself in opposition to the anti-slavery cause.

The following letter in the *Woman's Journal* shows that something of the spirit of the Connecticut Smith-sisters has been found in New Hampshire:

I have long felt a deep interest in the subject of woman's rights, and some fifteen years ago I resisted taxation two successive years. The

Digitized by Google

second year I worked out my highway tax, for which crime I brought down upon my guilty head a severe persecution from both men and women, from clergymen and lawyers, as well as other classes of my fellow townsmen. The tax-collectors came into my house and attached furniture and sold it at auction in order to collect my tax, one of whom made me all the cost the laws would allow. The most incensed town officers threatened that if I resisted taxation the next year, they would take my house from me and sell it at auction. One of the tax-gatherers asked me what I thought I could do alone in resisting taxation. He said he did not believe there was another woman in the State of New Hampshire who possessed the hardihood to take such a stand against the laws. The editor of one of our weekly journals, who professed to be an advocate of woman's rights, and who was a candidate for representative in the State legislature, condemned me through the columns of his paper, in order to secure the votes of his fellow townsmen who were opposed to woman's rights. He had nothing to fear from me, knowing that I was only a disfranchised slave. Such unjust treatment seemed so cruel that I sometimes felt I could willingly lay down my life, if it would deliver my sex from such degrading oppression. I have, every year since, submissively paid my taxes, humbly hoping and praying that I may live to see the day that women will not be compelled to pay taxes without representation.

MARY L. HARRINGTON.

Claremont, N. H., January 17, 1874.

In 1870 a law was passed allowing women to be members of school committees; and eight years later a law was enacted permitting women to vote at school meetings. On the evening of August 7, 1878, the House Special Committee granted a hearing to the friends* of the School-suffrage bill, which had already passed the Senate by a unanimous vote; and the next day, when the bill came up for final action in the House, the following debate occurred:

Mr. BATCHELDER of Littleton said: This bill is one of the greatest importance, and before we vote upon it let us have the views of the committee.

Mr. GALEN FOSTER of Canterbury called upon Mr. Blodgett to give his opinion as to the power of the legislature upon the question.

Mr. BLODGETT of Franklin said he had no doubt of the constitutionality of the bill. School districts were created by statute and not by the constitution; hence the legislature had a perfect right to say who should vote in controlling their affairs.

Mr. FOSTER said: The mothers of our children should have a voice in their education. We have allowed women to hold certain offices in connection with schools, but we have never given them a voice in the control of the money expended upon them. The mothers take ten times

* The speakers at this hearing were Mr. Galen Foster of Canterbury, Senators Gallinger and Shaw, Mrs. Abby Goold Woolson, H. P. Rolfe, S. B. Page, Rev. E. L. Conger and Mrs. Armenia S. White.

Digitized by Google

more interest in the education of the young than the fathers do, and should have an equal voice in the affairs of the school districts. This is a matter of right and justice.

Mr. SINCLAIR of Bethlehem said: There ought not to be any objection to this bill. If there is any class that ought to have a voice in the education of children, it is the mothers. [Applause.] Some of the best school committees in the State are women. If they can be elected to that office, is it proper to say they shall have no voice in the elections?

Mr. WHICHER of Strafford thought they would get a little mixed in carrying out the provisions of this bill, in the face of the statutes relating to school-district meetings. He would move to indefinitely postpone the bill.

Mr. MOSHER of Dover said: There ought to be a new motion gotten up; to "indefinitely postpone" is getting to be stereotyped. This bill needs no further championing. Its justice is apparent.

Mr. HOBBS of Ossippee said: If women are capable of holding office they are also capable of saying who shall hold it. [Applause.]

Mr. PATTEN of Manchester favored the bill and hoped the motion of Mr. Whicher would be voted down.

The SPEAKER [Mr. WOOLSON of Lisbon] said: The bill had passed the Senate unanimously, been reported unanimously by the committee, and he hoped it would be passed promptly by the House. [Applause.]

Mr. PATTERSON of Hanover said he would congratulate the gentleman from Bethlehem on being orthodox on this question.

Mr. SINCLAIR congratulated his friend from Hanover on his display of courage in waiting until the ice was broken all round before making a forward step.

Mr. Whicher withdrew his motion to postpone and then moved to lay the bill upon the table. This being lost, the bill was passed, August 8, 1878. Mrs. White, the president of the State association, in a letter to a friend, wrote as follows:

To our surprise and delight the bill allowing women to vote at school-district meetings passed the House yesterday amid much cheering and clapping of hands, the ladies in the gallery joining in the demonstration. Thus conservative New Hampshire leads New England in this branch of reform for women.

The governor, B. F. Prescott, signed the bill without delay, and words of cheer poured into the capital city from all quarters; especially were Mr. and Mrs. White congratulated upon this good result of their earnest and persistent labors. The following is from the *Woman's Journal:*

At the first election at the State capital of New Hampshire under the new law allowing women to vote on school questions, the result was a wonderfully full vote, not less than 2,160 ballots being cast, of which over half were deposited by women. The Boston *Investigator*, from which we gather these facts, says:

Digitized by Google

The balloting extended over three meetings and the number of women who participated was almost exactly doubled on the second and third evenings—150, 299, 662. Another interesting feature of this election was the fact that the sexes did not rally to the support of opposing tickets, but men and women divided their votes very evenly. A ticket bearing the names of two men was elected by a narrow majority over another which bore the names of a man and woman.

Of the first evening's election the telegraphic dispatch to the *Boston Globe* was headed, "Crowds of Women Voting in New Hampshire":

CONCORD, N. H., March 22.—The occasion of the annual meeting of the Union-school district of this city, which comprises all of the city proper, this evening, was one of unprecedented interest. For months school matters have been sharply agitated and the election has been looked forward to as an opportunity by all parties. To the uncommon interest centered in the matter the right of women to vote at school meetings, delegated by the last session of the legislature, greatly added. The new condition of affairs had been fully canvassed and the women had determined on making the best of their first opportunity and winning a decisive victory if possible. The night of the meeting proved inauspicious, but notwithstanding the severe storm of snow and sleet that was falling the newly constituted citizens were out in force. At the hour of opening the meeting the City Hall was packed to suffocation, 500 of the audience, at least, being ladies. The first business was the choice of a moderator, and in this the ladies may claim a victory, as the candidate a majority of them supported was elected in the person of ex-mayor John Kimball. After this came the reading of the report of the board of education, which was strenuously objected to by the male supporters of the ladies. In this they were beaten by a large majority. The reading completed, the meeting commenced to ballot for three members of the board. The scene then became one beyond the power of the reportorial pen to describe. It was an old-fashioned New Hampshire town-meeting, with the concomitant boisterousness and profanity subdued by the presence of the ladies. A line was formed to the polls and a struggling mass of humanity in which male and female citizens were incongruously and indecorously mixed, surged towards the ballot-box. The crowding, squeezing and pushing were severe enough for the taste of the masculine voter, and were harsh enough to make it extremely unpleasant for the dear creatures who were undergoing so much to cast their maiden vote. To add to the delay the Hon. Nathaniel White had planted his somewhat corpulent form directly in front of the ballot-box and stayed the surging tide to shake hands with every woman that voted. Having voted, the men were only too glad to leave the crowded hall and let the anxious crowd rush in. The vote was at last all in, and the work of counting completed shortly before 11 o'clock. It was found that there were some ten different tickets in the field, and forty-two candidates voted for; but from this mass of votes there was no choice, though the regular candidates, the outgoing members of the board, who would have been elected had it not been for the new element in the election, were ahead, having a plurality. The meeting was then adjourned till next Saturday evening, when the scenes of to-night will be intensified by a larger attendance and still greater interest. The meeting to-night obtains importance in New Hampshire, as this is the center of female suffrage sentiment in this State, and the women are determined to win here if possible.

In the opening convention of November 5, 1879, Mrs. White, the president, made the following address:

Ladies and Gentlemen, Friends of the N. H. Woman Suffrage Association: We hold the seventh meeting of this association under circumstances that mark an epoch in the progress of equal rights, irrespective of sex, in this State. After more than a decade of agitation, and petitioning of our legislature, women hold in their hand the ballot on one important

Digitized by Google

matter. Let us exchange congratulations on this occasion, that so much has been gained toward the final triumph of our cause.

You will remember when this association was last in session, July, 1878, that the bill giving the women of New Hampshire the right to vote on the public-school questions, was pending in our legislature. At our first hearing before that body, we hardly dared anticipate the passage of the bill during that session. But agitation, vigilance and perseverance ever bring their sure reward in the end, therefore we continued to press our claim, and soon learned to our great satisfaction that our allies in behalf of this bill, were the very *cream* of our legislature. We at once took courage, and as day after day we went up to the state-house, with friends who plead for it before the committee, who kindly gave us several hearings; we saw the gradual growth of interest in behalf of this bill soon ripen into a final decision causing it to pass; thereby enacting a law, to which our worthy governor, B. F. Prescott, immediately gave his willing signature, securing to the women of this State the high privilege many of them gladly exercised last spring. Many feared this law would be repealed; but to show with what favor it has been received, we have only to refer to the legislature of the present year, which passed an additional law, giving to women not only the right to vote for and serve on school boards, but also the power to serve as moderator or clerk in school meetings, for which the former law did not provide. This, it would seem must remove all fears of a repeal.

Petitions asking municipal suffrage for women, were sent to our last legislature, and a bill to that effect, introduced in the House, was referred to a special committee, who reported in its favor; and after more or less discussion, although the bill did not pass, about one hundred members voted for it, and their names are registered, and with the committee, will be kindly remembered by those women whose cause they did not desert. From past experience we see the importance of continued labor and proper measures for the accomplishment of our work. The present degree of progress indicates the fact that we are not to obtain the full recognition of our rights at one bound, but that they are coming step by step. To note the growth of our principles in the various reform movements, let us look at the temperance organizations throughout the length and breadth of this country; we find nearly all of them now discussing the ballot for women. Why, no sooner had Massachusetts, following the example of New Hampshire, obtained the school ballot for women, than the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions all over the State were a unit for the temperance ballot, and the past year have had their agents canvassing the State in the interest of school suffrage and "home protection."

All who read the reports last winter of Frances E. Willard's labors in Illinois in behalf of her Home Protection bill (for it originated with her), of the list of petitioners of both sexes she secured and took to Springfield, of the delegation of women who accompanied her there to advocate her bill, must acknowledge the educating force of all such untiring devotion for the right to vote. Although she was not victorious, she was

successful beyond all expectation, for it is said, "Success is not always a victory, nor is victory always a success in the end." Let me say here, Miss Willard believes in the entire enfranchisement of her sex, but in her earnest and faithful labors makes a specialty of the temperance ballot.

At the annual meeting of the New Hampshire Woman's Christian Temperance Union, held here one year ago, a resolution was offered by a most worthy lady, indorsing suffrage for women on all temperance questions. It was at once vigorously opposed by some, while others, although believing in it, feared it would divide their ranks if it passed, and felt too timid to give it their support. The lady offering it, seeing it would be defeated, withdrew it, at the same time giving notice that she should present the same, or one similar, to that body every year as long as she lived, or until it passed. Last month the same organization held its annual meeting in Portsmouth, and that lady, as good as her word, was there with her resolution on temperance suffrage, and it passed unanimously, about 100 delegates being present and voting, many of whom acknowledged the timidity they felt last year, but now earnestly gave it their support. Such experiences give us some idea of the different instrumentalities by which our cause is forced upon conservative minds for consideration, ending in honest conviction.

In closing, I know you will all unite with me in tributes to Mr. Garrison. Now that he has gone to join that innumerable host of philanthropists in the higher life, let us rejoice that he was one of the leaders of that reform which brings us here to-day. And now, friends, in view of the present status of our cause, have we not much to encourage us in our work? May we go forward in that spirit of good-will that shall bring us a speedy victory.

Resolutions of respect to the memory of Mrs. Abby P. Ela, William Lloyd Garrison and Angelina Grimké Weld were adopted by a rising vote.

In the *National Citizen* of December 14, 1879, we find the following:

Marilla M. Ricker of New Hampshire had an executive hearing before the governor and council of that State, November 18, in regard to the management of the State prison. Mrs. Ricker, who in winter practices law in Washington, and is known as "the prisoner's friend," referred to the cruel treatment of convicts in various States, notably in New Hampshire, where prisoners are not permitted to read the magazines or the weekly newspapers which contain no record of crime, nor to receive words from their friends, as in other States they are allowed at stated times to do. When Mrs. Ricker desired to see a certain prisoner and let him know he had friends who were yet mindful of his comfort, the warden replied that he did not wish that man "to think he had a friend in the world." Mrs. Ricker warmly protested against such brutality. The attorney-general agreed with Mrs. Ricker, remarking that the line between crimes punished and those not punished, and the lines between those in

Digitized by Google

prison and those outside who ought to be there, were so dim and shadowy that great care should be exercised in order to secure just and humane treatment for prisoners. Mrs. Ricker's remarks were earnest and dignified, and were listened to with the closest attention by the governor and his official advisers. At the close of the hearing the governor referred the subject to the special prison committee of the council, directing its members to procure all possible information as to the management of penitentiaries in other States, and report at the next meeting. Through Mrs. Ricker's influence the last legislature passed an act providing that any convict may send sealed letters to the governor or council without their being read by the warden.

In 1882 a judicial decision in New Hampshire recognized the advance legislation of that State in regard to the position of married women. This decision shows that they are no longer under the shadow of the old common law, but now hold equal dignity and power as individuals and joint heads in family life. The "divinely ordained head," with absolute control in the home, to rule according to his will and pleasure, is at last ruled out of the courts altogether, as the following case illustrates:

Mrs. Harris and her husband sued Mrs. Webster and her husband for slanders uttered by Mrs. Webster against Mrs. Harris. The suit was brought on the old theory that the legal personality of the wife is merged in that of her husband; that she is under his control, his chattel, his ox, and therefore he is responsible for her trespasses as for those of his other domestic cattle. The Court held that the wife is no longer an "ox" or "chattel," but a person responsible for her acts, and that her innocent husband could not be held responsible for her wrong. In rendering the decision in this case, Judge Foster further said: "It is no longer possible to say that in New Hampshire a married woman is a household slave or a chattel, or that in New Hampshire the conjugal unity is represented solely by the husband. By custom and by statute the wife is now joint master of the household, and not a slave or a servant. The rule now is that her legal existence is not suspended. So practically has the ancient unity become dissevered and dissolved that the wife may not only have her separate property, contracts, debts, wages, and causes of separate action growing out of a violation of her personal rights, but she may enter into legal contract with her husband and enforce it by suit against him."

The writer of the following letter is a successful farmer, remarkable for her executive ability in all the practical affairs of life, as well as for her broad philanthropy. One year she sent, as a contribution to our Washington convention, a tub of butter holding about sixty pounds, which was sold on the platform and the proceeds put into the treasury of the National Association:

Digitized by Google

Dear Friends assembled in the Washington Convention:

Last week our new town-house was dedicated. The women accompanied their husbands. One man spoke in favor of woman suffrage—said it was "surely coming." In this town, at the Corners, for several years they tried to get a graded school, but the men voted it down. After the women had the school-suffrage, one lady, who had a large family and did not wish to send her children away from home, rallied all the women of the Corners, carried the vote, and they now have a good graded school. Our village is moving down, that the boys and girls may have the benefit of the good school there. I think the women who have been indifferent and not availed themselves of their small voting privilege, by which we might have established the same class of school in our village, will now regret their negligence, at least every time they have to send three miles for a doctor. Thus, stupid people, blind to their own interest, punish themselves. I regret not being able to send a fuller report of the good that woman's use of the ballot, in a limited form, has done for us in this State. The voting in the town-hall is the "infant school" for women in the use of the ballot. Thanking the ladies all for meeting at the capital of the nation, and regretting not to be counted among the number, I am,

Yours sincerely, MARY A. P. FILLEY.

North Haverill, January 5, 1884.

In closing this chapter some mention should be made of the invaluable services of Senator Blair,* who, in his place, has always nobly defended the rights of women. He was a member of the first special committee ever appointed to look after the interests of women in the United States Senate. The leaders of the movement in that State claim that they helped to place Senator Blair in his present position by defeating his predecessor, Mr. Wadleigh, who was hostile to the enfranchisement of women.

UNITED STATES SENATE, WASHINGTON, D. C., March 5, 1884.

MY DEAR MISS ANTHONY: I had the honor duly to receive your invitation to address the National Association during its sessions in this city, for which I heartily thank you; but the pressure of duties in the Senate, service upon committees being just now specially exacting, makes it impossible for me to accept.

I trust that I need not assure you of my full belief that woman has the right and ought to have the privilege to vote. Whenever a fundamental right exists both public and individual welfare are promoted by its exercise and injured by its suppression. The exercise of rights is only another name for the discharge of duties, and the denial of the suffrage to an adult human being, not deprived of it for mental or penal disability, is an intolerable wrong. Such denial is not only a deprivation of right to the individual, but it is an injury to the State, which is only well governed when controlled by the conflicting opinions, sentiments and interests of the whole, harmonized in the ballot-box, and, by its fiat, elevated to the func-

* Reelected to the Senate, June, 1885.

Digitized by Google

tions of law. But you have no occasion for expression of theoretical views from me.

If I may be pardoned a suggestion, it would be the specification to the public mind of the practical uses and benefits which would result from the exercise of the suffrage by women. Men are not conscious that women lack the practical protection of the laws or the comforts and conveniences of material and social relations more than themselves. The possession of the ballot as a practical means of securing happiness does not appear to the masses to be necessary to women in our country. Men say: "We do the best we can for our wives and children and relatives. They are as well off as we." In a certain sense this appears to be true. The other and higher truth is that woman suffrage is necessary in order that society may advance. The natural conservatism of an existing order of things will not give way to a new factor in the control of affairs, until it has been shown in what way enlightened selfishness may hope for good to society if the change be made. Here it seems to me that the convention may now strike a blow more powerful than for many years. Society has not so labored with the great problems which concern its own salvation for generations.

What would woman do with the ballot if she had it? What for education? What for sobriety? What for social purity? What for equalizing the conditions and the rewards of labor—the labor of her own sex first—and towards a just division of production among all members of the community? What for the removal, or for the amelioration when removal is impossible, of hunger, cold, disease and degradation, from the daily lives of human beings? What could and what *would* woman do with the ballot which is not now as well done by man alone, to improve the conditions which envelope individual existence as with bands of iron? What good things—state them *seriatim*, as the lawyers say—could woman do in New Hampshire and in New York city, and ultimately among the savage tribes of the earth, which she cannot do as well without as with the suffrage? Would woman by her suffrage even *help* to remove illiteracy from Louisiana, intemperance from New England, and stop society from committing murder by the tenement-house abuses of New York? Let the convention specify what practical good woman will try to achieve with her God-given rights, provided that men will permit her to enjoy them. Show us wherein you will do *us* good if we will rob you no longer. It might influence us greatly. Why should we do right for nothing? In fact, unless you show that the exercise of your alleged right will be useful, can you logically conclude that you have any? We must have proof that the experiment will not fail before we will even try it. You must connect the ballot with progress and reform and convince men that they, as well as women, will be better off for its possession by the whole of the adult community rather than only by a part. Theories may be true, but they are seldom reduced to practice by society unless it can be clearly seen that their adoption will heal some hurt or introduce some broad and general good.

Digitized by Google

The increasing discussion of industrial, educational, sanitary, and social questions generally, indicates the domain of argument and effort where victories for the advocates of enlarged suffrage are most likely, and I think are sure to be won. Woman should study specially what is called, for the want of a better term, the labor problem—a problem which includes in its scope almost everything important to everybody. I know this is an unnecessary suggestion, for it is just what you are doing. I only write it because repetition of the important is better than to recite platitudes or even to quote the declaration. I believe in your success because I believe in justice and in the advancement of mankind.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant, HENRY W. BLAIR.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXXVI.

VERMONT.

Clarina Howard Nichols—Council of Censors—Amending the Constitution—St. Andrew's Letter—Mr. Reed's Report—Convention Called—H. B. Blackwell on the *Vermont Watchman*—Mary A. Livermore in the *Woman's Journal*—Sarah A. Gibbs' Reply to Rev. Mr. Holmes—School Suffrage.

AFTER the miseries growing out of the civil war were in a measure mitigated, there was a general awakening in the New England States on the question of suffrage for women, and in 1868 one after another organized for action. What Nathaniel P. Rogers was to New Hampshire in the anti-slavery struggle that was Clarina Howard Nichols* to Vermont in early calling attention to the unjust laws for woman. From 1843 to 1853 she edited the *Windham County Democrat*, in which she wrote a series of editorials on the property rights of women, and from year to year made her appeals in person to successive legislatures. Her patient labors for many years prepared the way for the organized action of 1868. The women of that State can never too highly appreciate all that it cost that noble woman to stand alone, as she did, through such bitter persecutions, vindicating for them the great principles of republican government.

And now, after a quarter of a century, instead of that one solitary voice in the district school-house and the State capitol, are heard in all Vermont's towns and cities, echoing through her valleys and mountains, the clarion voices of a whole band of distinguished men and women from all the Eastern States. The revival of the woman question in Vermont began with propositions to amend the constitution. We are indebted to a series of letters, written by a citizen of Burlington, signed "St. An-

* No woman in so many varied fields of action has more steadily and faithfully labored than Mrs. Nichols, as editor, speaker, teacher, farmer, in Vermont, New York, Wisconsin, Iowa, Ohio, Kansas, and California where she spent the closing years of her life; and though always in circumstances of hardship and privation, yet no annual convention was held without a long letter from her pen, uniformly the most cheerful and able of all that were received. A great soul that seemed to rise above the depressing influences of her surroundings! The last letter she ever wrote us was in January, 1885, a few days before she passed away. See Volume I., page 171.

drew," for many of the interesting incidents and substantial facts as to the iniative steps taken in this campaign. He said:

The only way of amending the constitution is for the people (meaning the male voters) to elect, every seventh year, a board called the Council of Censors, consisting of thirteen persons. This council can, within a certain time, propose amendments to the constitution, and call a convention of one delegate from each town, elected by the freemen, to adopt or reject the articles of amendment proposed by the council. The Council of Censors, elected in March, 1869, proposed six amendments: (1) In relation to the creation of corporations; (2) in relation to biënnial sessions and elections; (3) in relation to filling vacancies in the office of senators and town representatives; (4) in relation to the appointment, terms, etc., of judges of the Supreme Court; (5) providing that women shall be entitled to vote, and with no other restrictions than the law shall impose on men; (6) in relation to the manner of amending the constitution.

The election of delegates occurs on Tuesday, May 10, and the convention meets on the first Wednesday in June. There is no general excitement in the State in relation to any of the proposed changes; and now, upon the eve of the election, it is impossible for the most sagacious political observer to predict the fate of any of the amendments. The fifth is the only one in support of which public meetings have been held, and those took place the early part of the spring at the larger places in the State. The friends have never expected to obtain a majority, nor even a considerable vote in the convention, and the meetings that have been held were not expected to settle the question, but to awaken the public mind upon the subject. These meetings have been a decided success, attended by hundreds of intelligent citizens, many of whom for the first time listened to an address upon the subject. It is true that ladies were advised to remain away, but such advice generally resulted in a larger attendance; and today the measure has a firmer support than ever before, and its advocates are more confident of final success. We may not have more than "*ten righteous*" men elected to the convention, but that number was enough to save the cities of the *plain*, and we have full faith that as small a number can save the cities of the *mountains*.

The press of the State is divided on the subject. We have two dailies—one, the *Rutland Herald*, the oldest paper in the State, in favor of the movement, and the *Free Press* of Burlington, opposed to it. After the coming convention, no change can be made in our constitution for seven years, at least, and if the sixth amendment be adopted, not for ten years. But, in the meantime, the question will assume more importance by a constant agitation as to the equality of the sexes, the admission of women to the State University, the professions, and other rights to which men are entitled. Vermont can never emulate in wealth and population the manufacturing States of the seaboard, or the prairie States of the West; but she can win a nobler preëminence in the quality of her institutions. She may be the first State, as Wyoming

Digitized by Google

already is the first territory, to give political equality to woman, and to show the world the model of a true republic. ST. ANDREW.

Burlington, Vt., May 1, 1870.

Mr. Reed of Washington county submitted the report in favor of the woman suffrage amendment, from which we give the following:

One-half of the people of our State are denied the right of suffrage. Yet woman has all the qualifications—the capacity, the desire for the public welfare, that man has. She is among the governed. She pays taxes. Even-handed justice, a fair application of the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of our State constitution, give woman the ballot. There is no reason why woman should not be allowed to do what she is so eminently fit to do. We know no good reason why the most ignorant man should vote and the intelligent woman be refused. Our present political institutions were formed and shaped when men had their chief interests and pursuits out of doors, and women remained the humble slaves at home. The social change has been immense. Now woman sits by the side of man, is his companion and associate in his amusements, and in his labors, save the one of governing the country. And it is time that she should be in this.

The position of woman in regard to the common schools of the State is the most unjust. She must always be the chief instructor of the young in point of time and influence. She is their best teacher at home and in the school. And her share in this ever-expanding work is becoming vaster every day. Woman as mother, sister, teacher, has an intelligence, a comprehension of the educational needs of our youth, and an interest in their development, far in advance of the other sex. She can organize, control and teach the most difficult school in the State; yet she has no vote in the selection of teachers, the building, arrangements and equipments of school-houses, nor in the method and extent of instruction. She can pay her share of the expenses of schools, but can have no legal voice in their management. She can teach, but she can have no vote in determining what shall be taught. She is the very corner-stone of institutions which she has no power in shaping. Let us have her open, avowed and public coöperation—always safer than indirect influence.

The submission of an amendment to the constitution necessarily aroused a general agitation on the proposed changes. The fifth amendment decided on by the board of censors seemed to create a more general interest than either of the others, and accordingly a meeting was called for its full consideration, that efficient steps might be taken for a thorough canvass of the State, preparatory to the May election, and issued the following call:

The friends of woman suffrage in Vermont are requested to meet in mass convention at Montpelier on Wednesday, February 2, at 10 o'clock, for the purpose of con-

sidering and advancing the best interests of the cause in this State, in view of the constitutional amendment proposed by the council of censors. The convention will be addressed by several ladies and prominent gentlemen of this State, and by William Lloyd Garrison, Julia Ward Howe and Rev. Ada C. Bowles of Massachusetts; Lucy Stone and Henry B. Blackwell of New Jersey, and Mary A. Livermore of Illinois. A public meeting will also be held the evening before the convention, which will be addressed by some of the eminent speakers above named. The Hutchinson family will be present and sing their woman suffrage songs. The Vermont Central, Passumpsic, Rutland and Burlington and Bennington and Rutland lines of railroad will extend the courtesy of free return checks, provided they shall be applied for by twenty-five or more persons paying full fare one way over an average distance of each of their respective roads, which will be determined by the secretary.

C. W. WILLARD, JAMES HUTCHINSON, JR.,
GEORGE H. BIGELOW, CHARLES REED,
NEWMAN WEEKS, JONATHAN ROSS,
JAMES S. PECK.
*Ex. Com. Vermont Woman Suffrage Association.**

Montpelier, January 10, 1870.

It is a noticeable fact that the movement for the enfranchisement of woman in Vermont was inaugurated wholly by men. Not a woman was on its official board, nor was there one to speak in the State. Men called the first woman's rights convention, and chose Hon. Charles Reed of Montpelier as its presiding officer, as well as president of the State association.

However, these gentlemen invited ladies from other States, and a series of meetings† was inaugurated through the chief towns and cities of Vermont. The speakers‡ were heartily welcomed at some points and rudely received at others. The usual "free-love" cry was started by some of the opposition papers—a cry that like "infidel" in the anti-slavery days, oft' times frightened even the faithful from their propriety. Henry B. Blackwell came to the rescue, and ably answered the *Vermont Watchman:*

The *Vermont Watchman* evades the discussion of the question whether women shall be entitled to vote, by raising false issues. The editor asserts that "many of the advocates of suffrage have thrown scorn upon

* Officers of the Vermont Woman Suffrage Association: *President*, Hon. Charles Reed, Montpelier. *Vice-presidents*, Hon. John B. Hollister, Bennington; Hon. Seneca M. Dorr, Rutland; Rev. Addison Brown, Brattleboro'; Col. Lynus E. Knapp, Middlebury; Hon. James Hutchinson, jr., West Randolph; Hon. Russell S. Taft, Burlington; Hon. A. J. Willard, St. Johnsbury; Hon. H. Henry Powers, Hyde Park; Hon. Jasper Rand, St. Albans. *Recording Secretary*, Henry Clark, Rutland. *Corresponding Secretary*, Albert Clarke, St. Albans. *Treasurer*, Albert D. Hager, Proctorsville. *Executive Committee*, Hon. C. W. Willard, Montpelier; Hon. Charles Reed, Montpelier; George H Bigelow, Burlington; Newman Weeks, Rutland; Hon. Jonathan Ross, St. Johnsbury; Rev. Eli Ballou, D. D., Montpelier.

† Following the convention at Montpelier, meetings were held at St. Albans, Northfield, Barre, Burlington, St. Johnsbury, Brattleboro', Rutland, Fairhaven, Castleton, Springfield and Bellows Falls.

‡ Among the speakers were Mr. Garrison, Mrs. Howe, Mrs. Stone, Leo Miller, Mrs. Churchill, Mrs. Livermore, Mrs. Campbell, Dr. Sarah Hathaway, Mrs. Bowles, Mr. Blackwell, Hon. A. J. Williard. Mr. Taft, Mr. Clark, Judge Carpenter, Mr. Ivison, the Rev. Messrs. Brigham, Eastwood, Brown and Emerson.

Digitized by Google

marriage and upon the Divine Word." That assertion we denounced as an unfounded and wicked calumny. We also objected to it as an evasion of the main question. Thereupon the *Watchman*, instead of correcting its mistake and discussing the question of suffrage, repeats the charge, and seeks to sustain it by garbled quotations and groundless assertions, which we stigmatized accordingly. The *Watchman* now calls upon us to retract the stigma. We prefer to prove that our censure is deserved, and proceed to do so.

The first quotation of the *Watchman* is from an editorial in the *Woman's Journal*, entitled "Political Organization." The object of which was to show the propriety of doing what the *Watchman* refuses to do—viz.: of discusstng woman suffrage upon its own merits. It showed the unfairness of complicating the question with other topics upon which friends of woman suffrage honestly differ. It regretted that "many well-meaning people insist on dragging in their peculiar views on theology, temperance, marriage, race, dress, finance, labor, capital—it matters not what." It condemned "a confusion of ideas which have no logical connection," and protested "against loading the good ship, Woman Suffrage, with a cargo of irrelevant opinions." The *Watchman* cites this article as an admission that some of the friends of suffrage advocate free-love. Not at all. The editor of the *Watchman* is himself one of the well-meaning people alluded to. He insists on dragging in irrelevant theological and social questions. He refuses to confine himself to the issue of suffrage. The *Watchman* quotes a single sentence of the following statement:

> The advocates of woman's equality differ utterly upon every other topic. Some are abolitionists, others hostile to the equality of races. Some are evangelical Christians; others Catholics, Unitarians, Spiritualists, or Quakers. Some hold the most rigid theories with regard to marriage and divorce; others are latitudinarian on these questions. In short, people of the most opposite views agree in desiring to establish woman suffrage, while they anticipate very different results from the reform, when effected.

The above is cited as evidence against us. How so? A man may hold "latitudinarian theories in regard to marriage and divorce" without "throwing scorn upon the marriage relation," or having the slightest sympathy with free-love. For instance: The present law of Vermont is latitudinarian is these very particulars. It grants divorce for many other causes than adultery. Measured by the more conservative standard of Henry Ward Beecher and Mary A. Livermore, it allows divorce upon insufficient grounds. This law represents the public sentiment of a majority of the people of Vermont. Will the *Watchman* assert that the people of Vermont "throw scorn on the marriage relation"? Or that he is in "low company" because he is surrounded by the citizens of a State who entertain views upon the marriage relation less rigid than his own? Our indignant protest against the injustice of the common law, which subjects the person, property, earnings and children of married women to the irresponsible control of their husbands, is not a protest against marriage. It is a vindication of marriage, against the barbarism of the law which de-

Digitized by Google

grades a noble and life-long partnership of equals into a mercenary and servile relation between superior and dependant.

The *Watchman* assails prominent supporters of woman suffrage, and misquotes and misrepresents them. Because Theodore Tilton is unwilling "that men or women shall be compelled to live together as husband and wife against the inward protest of their own souls," therefore he is charged with advocating free-love. Is it possible that the editor regards such a relation of protest and disgust as consistent with the unity of Christian marriage? Is it right that a pure and noble man, the tender husband of a happy wife, the loving father of affectionate children, should be thus causelessly traduced for showing that the essential fact of marriage is in that unity of soul which is recognized and affirmed by the outward form? When the *Watchman* undertakes to brand men and women of irreproachable character for an intellectual difference, he is engaged in a very unworthy business. When he charges immorality upon the *New York Independent* and infidelity upon John Stuart Mill, he forgets that his readers have minds of their own.

But, suppose it were true that newspapers and individuals who believe in woman suffrage held objectionable views on other subjects, what has this to do with the merit of the proposed reform? There are impure and intemperate men in the Republican party. Is the Republican party therefore "low company"? There are brutal and ignorant and disloyal men in the Democratic party. Does this prove that Dr. Lord and every other Democrat in the State of Vermont is brutal and ignorant and disloyal? The Supreme Court of the United States has just decided that a divorce obtained under the laws of Indiana is legal and binding in every other State. In thus affirming Mrs. McFarland's right to marry Mr. Richardson, has the Supreme Court of the United States sanctioned free-love? Will the *Watchman* call Chief-Justice Chase and the Supreme Court free-lovers? We have very little hope that the *Watchman* will treat this question with fairness or candor. Our cause is too strong. The argument from reason, from revelation, from nature, from history, is on our side. The *Watchman* is fighting against the Declaration of Independence, the bill of rights of the State of Vermont, and the principles of representative government. No wonder that it raises false issues. No wonder that it evades the question. H. B. B.

The following editorial in the *Woman's Journal*, from the pen of Mary A. Livermore, does not give a very rose-colored view of the reception of the Massachusetts missionaries on their first advent into Vermont:

The Vermont constitutional convention has rejected a proposition to give the ballot to woman, by a vote of 231 to 1. It flouted all discussion of the question, and voted it down with the utmost alacrity. No one cognizant of the bigotry, narrowness and general ignorance that prevail there will be surprised at this result. It is not a progressive State, but the contrary. Great stress has been laid on the fact that "Vermont never owned a slave"—and from this it has been argued that the Green Moun-

Digitized by Google

tain State is and has been especially liberty-loving. But during the two brief visits we made last winter, we were told again and again, by Vermont men, that the only reason for the non-introduction of slavery was the impracticability of that form of labor among the Green Mountains—that slavery could never have been made profitable there, and that this, and not principle and heroic love of freedom, prevented Vermont from ever being a slave State. Nowhere, not even in the roughest and remotest West, have we met with such vulgar rudeness, ill-manners and heroic lying as we encountered in Vermont. The lecturers who were invited into the State by the Vermont Woman Suffrage Association, composed wholly of men, were in many instances left unsupported by them, allowed to meet the frequently rough audiences as best they could, to pay their own bills, and to manage the campaign as they might. At the very first intimation of opposition on the part of the *Montpelier Argus*, the *Watchman* and the *Burlington Free Press*—an unworthy trio of papers that appear to control the majority—many members of the State association showed the "white feather," and either apologetically backed out of the canvass, or ignominiously kept silent in the background. There was, therefore, nothing like a thorough discussion of the question, no fair meeting of truth and error, not even an attempt to canvass the State. For, not ambitious to waste their efforts on such flinty soil, the men and women who were invited to labor there shook off the dust (snow) of Vermont from their feet, and turned to more hopeful fields of labor.

Let it not be supposed, however, that this vote of the delegates of the constitutional convention is any indication of the sentiment of the women on this question. The fact that 231 women of lawful age, residents of Brattleborough, and 96 of Newfane, sent a petition for woman suffrage, with their reasons for asking it, to Charles K. Field, delegate from that town to the constitutional convention; that petitions from other hundreds of women have been forwarded to congress, praying for a sixteenth amendment, that, by letters and personal statements, we know the most intelligent and thoughtful women everywhere rebel against the State laws whose heathenism, despotism and absurdity were so well shown by Mrs. Nichols in 1845—all these facts are proofs that the sentiment of Vermont women is not represented by the constitutional convention now in session at Montpelier.—[M. A. L.

August 12, 1871, our Burlington correspondent says:

While conventions, picnics and bazar meetings, in the cause of woman suffrage, have been held in our sister States, an event has very quietly occurred with us which we deem an important step in the right direction, viz.: the admission of women to the University. By an almost unanimous vote of the corporation, a few conservatives opposing it, the matter was referred to the faculty, who are understood to be heartily in favor of the "new departure." The college that has thus thrown its doors wide open to all, is the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College, founded by the munificence of General Ira Allen in 1791. It commenced operations in 1800; the Federal troops used its buildings for barracks in the war of 1812; the buildings (and library) were burned in 1824, and re-

Digitized by Google

constructed in the following year, when the corner-stone was laid by General Lafayette. It sent forth nearly all its sons to the great rebellion. Indeed, at one time its condition served to remind one of the lines of Holmes—

> "Lord, how the *Senior* knocked about
> That Freshman class of *one*."

It has graduated such men as the late Senator Collamer, John G. Smith, president of the Northern Pacific Railroad; William G. T. Shedd, the learned theologian; the late Henry J. Raymond of the New York *Times;* John A. Kasson of Iowa, Frederick Billings, and a host of others, eminent in all the walks of life. Its late president, who was an "Angell from Providence," and has just been elected president of Michigan University, is heartily in favor of the movement, and the president-elect, Matthew H. Buckham, is no less so. With its new president and its "new departure" the future bids fair even to outshine the past.

It may be well to inquire the reason why a college located in a State regarded by outsiders "as the most conservative of the Union on the woman suffrage question," should take a step so far in advance of what has been deemed the prevailing sentiment. Editors who have been battling the new reform with a zeal equaled only by that manifested against abolitionism a few years since, can see no necessary connection between the new movement and the general cause of woman's emancipation. Whether necessary or not, there is a practical connection between them which is being felt more and more every day. I assert, with no fear of contradiction by any observing man, that Vermont is no more committed against woman suffrage than any other State in the East, and the fact that but one man in our late convention voted to extend the right of suffrage to all, can well be explained when we consider the manner of choosing delegates by towns; one town, for instance, with twelve voters, having the same voice in the representation that this city has with 1,500. With a popular vote upon that question the State would give such a majority as would fairly astonish all those who regarded the late convention as a complete demolition of the "reformers." ST. ANDREW.

The following criticism of the Rev. Mr. Holmes, from the pen of a woman, shows the growing self-assertion of a class hitherto held in a condition of subordination by clerical authority. Such tergiversation in the pulpit as his has done much to emancipate woman from the reverence she once felt for the teaching of those supposed to be divinely ordained of heaven:

BENSON, Vt., June 20, 1871.

I have heard it stated from the pulpit within a year that the woman suffrage question in Vermont is dead. Well, we believe in the resurrection. Week by week this question of the hour and of the age confronts those who claim to have given it decent burial. The same clergyman who pronounced it dead has since spoken of it as one of the "growing evils of the times," and in this beautiful summer weather he has felt called upon to preach another sermon, ostensibly on "marriage," really upon this "dead

Digitized by Google

question," dragging it out to daylight again, that we might see how easily he could bury it fifty fathoms deep—with mud. It reminded me of Robert Laird Collier's sermon, "The Folly of the Woman Movement," in its logic and its spirit. Mr. Collier and our Mr. Holmes see but one thing in all this struggle for truth and justice, and that is "free-love." Here are some specimens of Mr. Holmes' assertions:

The advocates of woman's rights want, not the ballot so much as the dissolution of the marriage tie. They propose to form a tie for the term of five, six or seven years. Mark the men or women who are the most strenuous advocates of woman suffrage. They are irreligious and immoral.

Who are more strenuous advocates of woman suffrage than Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, Mrs. Isabella Beecher Hooker, Mrs. Lucy Stone, Mrs. Lucretia Mott, Mrs. Livermore, T. W. Higginson, Henry Ward Beecher, Bishop Simpson, Governor Claflin, Gilbert Haven, Wendell Phillips, and scores of others whose lives are as pure and intellects as fine as his who dares stand in the sacred desk and call these persons "irreligious and immoral"? His argument seems to be like this: Some advocates of woman suffrage are in favor of easy divorces. These men and women advocate woman suffrage; therefore these men and women are in favor of easy divorces. Or, to make the matter still plainer, some ministers of the Gospel are immoral. Mr. H. is a minister of the Gospel; therefore Mr. H. is immoral. The method of reasoning is the same, but it don't sound quite fair and honorable, does it?

"In our land woman is a queen; she is loved and cared for," says Mr. Holmes. In sight from the window where I write is a sad commentary upon this. One of these queens, so tenderly cared for, is hoeing corn, while her five-months-old baby—the youngest of nine children—lies on the grass while she works. Her husband is away from home, but has left word for the "old woman" to "take care of the corn and potatoes, for he has to support the family." When they are out of meat, she must go out washing and earn some, for "he has to support the family," and cannot have her idle. Not long since they were planting corn together, she doing as much as he. At noon, although she had a pail of milk and another of eggs, he brought her the two hoes to carry home, as he could not be troubled with them. Had he ever read:

> "I will be master of what is my own;
> She is my goods, my chattels—
> My horse, my ox, my ass, my anything"?

"No woman reaches such dignity as the New England wife and mother," says Mr. H. Is wifehood more honorable, or motherhood more sacred, in New England than in other places? Is to be a wife and mother, and nothing else, the sole end and aim of woman? Or is there not other work in God's universe which some woman may possibly be called upon to do? Is Florence Nightingale or Anna Dickinson less dignified than Mrs. John Smith, who happens physically to be the mother of half-a-dozen children, but mentally and morally is as much of a child as any of them?

"Woman has just the sphere she wants. She has more privileges than she could vote herself into," says Mr. H. Has she, indeed? I know women, who would gladly vote themselves into the privilege of having

Digitized by Google

the custody of their own children, whose husbands are notoriously drunken and licentious. They are pure, good women, who, rather than part with their children, live on with men whose very breath is pollution. I know others who would like to vote themselves into the privilege of retaining their own hard earnings instead of having them sacrificed by a drunken husband. Widows have been literally turned out of doors after their husbands' death, and the property they had helped to accumulate divided among those who never earned it. Do you think such women would not change the laws of inheritance if they had the power?

"Husband and wife are one, hence one vote is sufficient," says Mr. H. Follow out the reasoning, if you please. "Both one," hence one dinner is sufficient, "both one," hence if a man is a member of a church his wife is also. In plain English, "the husband and wife are both one," and the husband is that one. Now in case *that one* should die, is it fair, or just, or fitting, that the widow—"the relict"—or, in the words of Mr. H., "the feminine spirit that has supplemented this masculine nature," whose hands have been tied all these years, should be called upon to pay taxes upon the share of property the law allows her? Taxation without representation was the immediate cause of the famous tea-party in Boston harbor, and, in fact, of a good many other unpleasant things that followed.

"Woman has just the sphere she wants," says Mr. H., closing the discussion. No, sir, she has not. Had those young ladies in Philadelphia who were studying medicine, and were insulted day after day by the male medical students, the sphere they wanted? Our American girls have been to Europe for the sake of pursuing their studies in medicine, and have met with kindness and courtesy, while in this land, where they are called "queens," they received only hisses. Last winter Governor Claflin of Massachusetts—one of those "irreligious and immoral" advocates of woman suffrage—reminded the gentlemen of that State who claim to be woman's representatives in the legislature, "that a wife in that State is deprived of the free control of property that was her own before marriage, and is denied an equal right in the property accumulated during the marriage partnership; that a married mother has no legal right to her child; and that a widow has not equal rights with a widower." When woman has the sphere she wants, these things will be changed.

As a majority of the men in this community are opposed to woman suffrage, I will relate one circumstance that will do to "point a moral or adorn a tale." Of course, the voters in this or any other place always elect their best men to hold office, and the board of selectmen would naturally be the very wisest and best, the "*crème de la crème.*" Now it so happens that one selectman being away from home, there was not enough arithmetic left with the other two to make out the tax-bills for the town, and they hired a woman, the mother of two children, to do it for them. It certainly took more of her time than it would for her to have walked across the street and voted for men who could make out their own tax-bills. Then arithmetic is not a womanly accomplishment, like tatting, crocheting, etc. These things sink into our hearts, and will bear fruit in due season.

SARAH A. GIBBS.

Digitized by Google

In 1877, July 21, Miss Thyrza F. Pangborn, for the last six years the capable and efficient recorder in the probate office of Burlington, was appointed and sworn as a notary public. In a letter of December 7, 1872, our correspondent says:

In the year 1870, the world was somewhat startled by the fact that in the constitutional convention, held that year in Vermont, but one vote was cast for the enfranchisement of woman; and no one wonders that the friends of that movement exclaimed, "Can any good come out of—Vermont"? Yesterday the first biënnial session of the legislature closed its session of fifty-seven days. A bill has been pending in each House, giving female tax-payers a right to vote at all school-district meetings. It was advocated by Mr. Butterfield, one of the leading members of the House, in an able and learned speech, and received 64 votes to 103 against. Is not that doing well for such a staid old State as Vermont, and one where the enemies of equal suffrage supposed, two years since, that the measure was indefinitely postponed? But this is not all. The measure was introduced in the Senate, composed of thirty members, who are supposed to be the balance-wheel of the General Assembly. It was warmly discussed by several Senators, and the vote taken, when there were three members absent, resulting in, yeas 13, nays 14. Had the Senate been full, the vote would have been, yeas 14,* nays 16. A change of one of the "no" votes would have carried the measure, as the lieutenant-governor, who presides in the Senate, would have given the casting vote in its favor.

The supporters of the measure included some of the ablest members of the Senate, among them the chairmen of the very important Committees on Finance, Claims, Education, Agriculture, Manufactures, Railroads and Printing.

Following the defeat of the above-mentioned bill came up a measure granting to women the same right to vote as men have in all elections everywhere in the State. It received the support of all who voted for the school measure, save two, Mr. Mason and Mr. Rogers, who prefer to see the first tried as an experiment in the school meetings. You thus perceive that twelve out of our thirty grave and reverend Senators are real out-and-out equal suffrage men. Verily, the world moves! Another year, 1874, we hope will carry off the measure. Meanwhile, we say, three cheers for old Vermont, and glory enough for one day! ST. ANDREW.

Burlington, Vt.

* The fourteen who favored the bill were: Mr. Bigelow of Burlington, one of the leading editors in the State; Mr. Butterfield of Grafton, one of the most experienced legislators in the State; Mr Carpenter of Northfield, who is known to be right on all questions that concern humanity, Mr. Colton of Irasburgh, now serving his second term in the Senate; Mr. Estey of Brattleboro', the manufacturer of the celebrated cottage organ; Mr. Houghton of North Bennington, a leading banker and business man who has just been elected one of the directors of our state-prison; Mr. King of North Montpelier, farmer; Mr. Lamb of Royalton, the oldest member in the Senate, a lawyer; Mr. Mason of Richmond, a man who would be described by a Yankee as "chock full of honesty and common-sense"; Mr. Rogers of Wheelock and Mr Stiles of Montgomery, both farmers, and as near like Mr. Mason as two peas are alike; Mr. Reynolds of Alburgh Springs, one of the absentees, but in favor of the bill, a prominent merchant; Mr. Powers, one of the ablest lawyers in the State, and, finally, Mr. Sprague of Brandon, a leading banker and manufacturer, the head and principal owner of the Brandon Manufacturing Company

Digitized by Google

In 1880 the School Suffrage bill passed the Vermont House of Representatives, with only four dissenting votes. When the bill came to a third reading and only four men stood up for the negative, there was so marked an expression of derision that the speaker called for "order," and reminded the House that "no man was to be scorned for voting alone any more than with a crowd." The action and the voting came cheerily. More than one man, to the objection of "an entering wedge," said "he was ready to grant the whole." The bill passed the Senate triumphantly and was approved by the governor, December 18, 1880:

Women shall have the same right to vote as men have, in all school-district meetings and in the election of school commissioners in towns and cities, and the same right to hold office relating to school affairs.

An item in the *Woman's Journal*, from Vergennes, March 22, 1881, says:

At the city election to-day General J. H. Lucia, a staunch friend of woman suffrage, was elected mayor, and principally through his management Miss Electa S. Smith has been chosen to the office of city clerk, which office he has held for the past two years. The legislature of 1880 authorized the election of women to the offices of superintendent of schools and town clerk, and some of the friends of the cause were disposed to try the working of the law here. They selected a candidate whose ability, qualifications and thorough fitness all had to concede, and against whom the only objection that could be raised was her being a woman. It took the conservatives some time to get over their surprise at the first suggestion of her name, but they admitted the propriety of the thing and gallantly lent a hand, so that when the election came all the candidates who had been talked about were conspicuous by their absence, and Miss Smith was elected by acclamation. Surely the world does move.

SPRINGFIELD, February 7, 1884.

Miss Lydia Putnam, Brattleboro', Vt.:

Your letter is at hand. I think but few women have, as yet, availed themselves of the privilege of voting in school meetings in this State, and I am not able to say what the effect upon our schools has been up to the present time. Very respectfully, JUSTUS DARTT.

Notwithstanding the above reply from the state-superintendent of the public schools of Vermont, the Associated Press reports of every year since 1881 make mention of women being elected to school offices in the various towns and counties of the State.

* In 1885 there were thirty-three women elected to the office of school superintendent in eleven of the fourteen counties of the State, as follows: *Addison*, Miss A. L. Huntley; *Bennington*, Mrs. R. R. Wiley; *Caledonia*, Miss Nellie Russell, Mrs. A. F. Stevens, Mrs. E. Bradley, Miss S. E. Rogers; *Chittenden*, Mrs. S. M. Benedict, Mrs. L. M. Bates, Mrs. J. C. Draper; *Essex*, Mrs. Henry Fuller, Hettie W. Matthews, Jennie K. Stanley, Mrs. S. M. Day; *Franklin*, none; *Grand Isle*, Miss I. Montgomery; *La Moille*, Carrie P. Carroll, Miss C. A. Parker; *Orange*, Miss F. H. Graves, Miss A. A. Clement, Miss V. L. Farnham, Miss F. Martin; *Orleans*, none; *Rutland*, Mrs. I. C. Adams, Miss H. M. Bromley, Miss M. A. Mills, Lillian Tarbell, Mrs. H. M. Crowley; *Washington*, none; *Windham*, Mrs. J. M. Powers, Mrs. J. E. Phelps, *Windsor*, Mrs. E. G. White, Miss C. A. Lamb, Mrs. H. F. VanCor, Clara E. Perkins, Mrs. E. M. Lovejoy, Mrs. L. M. Hall.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXXVII.

NEW YORK—1860-1885.

Saratoga Convention, July 13, 14, 1869—State Society Formed, Martha C. Wright, President—*The Revolution* Established, 1868—Educational Movement—New York City Society, 1870, Charlotte B. Wilbour, President—Presidential Campaign, 1872—Hearings at Albany, 1873—Constitutional Commission—An Effort to Open Columbia College, President Barnard in Favor—Centennial Celebration, 1876—School Officers—Senator Emerson of Monroe, 1877—Gov. Robinson's Veto—School Suffrage, 1880—Gov. Cornell Recommended it in his Message—Stewart's Home for Working Women—Women as Police—An Act to Prohibit Disfranchisement—Attorney-General Russell's Adverse Opinion—The Power of the Legislature to Extend Suffrage—Great Demonstration in Chickering Hall, March 7, 1884—Hearing at Albany, 1885—Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Rogers, Mrs. Howell, Gov. Hoyt of Wyoming.

THE New York chapter in Volume I. closes with an account of some retrogressive legislation on the rights of married women,* showing that until woman herself has a voice in legislation her rights may be conceded or withheld at the option of the ruling powers, and that her only safety is in direct representation. The chapter on "Trials and Decisions" in Volume II., shows the injustice women have suffered in the courts, where they have never yet enjoyed the sacred right of trial by a jury of their own peers.

After many years of persistent effort for the adjustment of special grievances, many of the leaders, seeing by what an uncertain tenure their civil rights were maintained by the legislative and judicial authorities, ceased to look to the State for redress, and turned to the general government for protection in the right of suffrage, the fundamental right by which all minor privileges and immunities are protected. Hence the annual meeting of the National Association, which had been regularly held in New York as one of the May anniversaries, was, from 1869, supplemented by a semi-annual convention in Washington for special influence upon congress.

* It has recently been ascertained that the first woman's rights petition sent to the New York State legislature was by Miss Mary Ayers, in 1834, for a change in the property laws. It was ten or fifteen feet long when unrolled, and is still buried in the vaults of the capitol at Albany.

Digitized by Google

Until the war the work in New York was conducted by a central committee; but in the summer of 1869, the following call was issued for a convention at Saratoga Springs, to organize a State Society:

The advocates of woman suffrage will hold a State convention at Saratoga Springs on the thirteenth and fourteenth of July, 1869. The specific business of this convention will be to effect a permanent organization for the State of New York. Our friends in the several congressional districts should at once elect their delegates, in order that the whole State may be represented in the convention. In districts where delegates cannot be elected, any person can constitute himself or herself a representative. The convention will be attended by the ablest advocates of suffrage for woman, and addresses may be expected from Elizabeth Cady Stanton, president of the National Association, Celia Burleigh, president of the Brooklyn Equal Rights Association, Matilda Joslyn Gage, advisory counsel for the State, Susan B. Anthony, of *The Revolution*, Charlotte B. Wilbour of New York city, and others. Every woman interested for her personal freedom should attend this convention, and by her presence, influence and money, aid the movement for the restoration of the rights of her sex.

MRS. ELIZABETH B. PHELPS, *Vice-President for the State of New York.*
MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Advisory Counsel.*

The opening session of the convention was held in the spacious parlors of Congress Hall the audience composed chiefly of fashionable ladies* from all parts of the country, who listened with evident interest and purchased the tracts intended for distribution. The remaining sessions were held in Hawthorn Hall, Matilda Joslyn Gage presiding. A series of spirited resolutions was adopted, also a plan of organization presented by Charlotte B. Wilbour, for a State association.† Many able speakers ‡ were present. The formation of this society was the result of a very

* Many years afterwards, lecturing in Texas, I met a party of ladies from Georgia, thoroughly awake on all questions relating to women. Finding ourselves quite in accord, I said, "how did you get those ideas in Georgia?" "Why," said one, "some of our friends attended a woman's convention at Saratoga, and told us what was said there, and gave us several tracts on all phases of the question, which were the chief topics of discussion among us long after." Southern women have suffered so many evils growing out of the system of slavery that they readily learn the lessons of freedom.—[E. C. S.

† The following were elected officers of the association. *President*, Martha C. Wright, Auburn. *Vice-Presidents*, Celia Burleigh, Brooklyn; Rachel S. Martin, Albany; Lydia A. Strowbridge, Cortland; Jennie White, Syracuse: Eliza W. Osborn, Auburn; Sarah G. Love, Ithaca; W. S. V. Rosa, Watertown; Mary M. R. Parks, Utica; Amy Post, Rochester; Candace S. Brockett, Brockett's Bridge; Ida Greeley, Chappaqua; Mary Hunt, Waterloo. *Secretary*, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Fayetteville. *Executive Committee*, Lucy A. Brand, Emeline A. Morgan, Mrs. H. Stewart, Samuel J. May, Rhoda Price, all of Syracuse. *Advisory Counsel*, for First Judicial District, Susan B. Anthony, New York; Second, Sarah Schram, Newburgh; Third, Sarah H. Hallock, Milton; Fourth, Caroline Mowry Holmes, Greenwich; Fifth, Ann T. Randall, Oswego; Sixth, Mrs. Professor Sprague, Ithaca, Seventh, Harriet N. Austin, Dansville; Eighth, Helen P. Jenkins, Buffalo.

‡ The speakers were Celia Burleigh, Susan B. Anthony, Charlotte B. Wilbour, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Mrs. Bedortha, of Saratoga, Mrs. Strowbridge, of Cortland, Mrs. Norton, J. N. Holmes, esq., Judge McKean, Rev. Mr. Angier, Hon. Wm. Hay. See Vol. II., page 402, for Mrs. Burleigh's letter on this Saratoga convention.

Digitized by Google

general agitation in different localities on several vital questions in the preceding year:

First—On taxation. Women being large property holders, had felt the pressure during the war, especially of the tax on incomes, and had resolved on resistance. Accordingly, large meetings * were called at various points, in 1868. While women of wealth were organizing to resist taxation, the working women † were uniting to defend their earnings, and secure better wages. It seemed for a few months as if they were in a chronic condition of rebellion. But after many vain struggles for redress in the iron teeth of the law, and equally vain appeals to have unjust laws amended, the women learned the hopelessness of all efforts made by disfranchised classes.

Second—On prostitution. For the first time in the history of the government, a bill was presented in the New York legislature, in 1868, proposing to license prostitution. This showed the degradation of woman's position as no other act of legislation could have done, and although the editors of *The Revolution* were the only women who publicly opposed the bill (which they did both before the committee of the legislature, and in their journal), yet there was in the minds of many, a deep undercurrent of resistance to the odious provisions of that bill. Horace Greeley, too, in his editorials in the New York *Tribune*, denounced the proposition in such unmeasured terms that, although pressed at three different legislative sessions, no member of the committee could be found with sufficient moral hardihood to present the bill.

In connection with this question, the necessity of "women as police," was for some time a topic of discussion. They had

* The Board of Trustees of Mt. Vernon, Westchester county, called a meeting of taxpayers of that village on July 19, 1868, to vote upon the question of levying a tax of $6,000 for the purpose of making and repairing highways and sidewalks, and for sundry other public improvements. Over sixty per cent. of the real-estate owners being women, they resolved upon asserting their right to a voice in the matter, and issued a call for a meeting, signed by the following influential ladies: Mrs. M. J. Law, Mrs. H. H. Leaver, Mrs. Olive Leaver, Mrs. J. Haggerty, Mary H. Macdonald, Mrs. Dorothy Ferguson, Mrs. M. J. Farrand, Mrs. Jeanette Oron, Mrs. Thirza Clark, Mrs. S. J. Clark, Mrs. Nettie Morgan, Mrs. D. Downs, Miss L. M. Hale, Miss Susie Law, Mrs. Celia Pratt, Mrs. Sabra Talcott, Mrs. Mary Wilkie, Mrs. Elizabeth Latham, Mrs. Mary C. Brown, Mrs. J. M. Lockwood, Mrs. May Howe, Mrs. Adaline Baylis, Mrs. J. Harper, Miss Elizabeth Eaton, Miss C. Frederiska Scharft, Mrs. S. A. Hathaway, Mrs. Margaret Hick, Mrs. Rebecca Dimmic, Mrs. Catharine Alphonse, Miss Julia Cheney, Mrs. E. Watkins, Mrs. L. M. Pease, Mrs. Margaret Coles, Mrs. Ruth Smith, Mrs. Mary A. Douglas, Mrs. Sarah Valentine, Mrs. H. C. Jones, Mrs. J. Tomlinson, Mrs. Amanda Carr, Mrs. Margaret Wooley, Mrs. S. Seeber, Mrs. B. Powers, Mrs. S. A. Waterhouse, Mrs. H. M. Smith. But notwithstanding the numbers, wealth, and social influence of the women, their demand was rejected, while hundreds of men, who had never paid a dollar's tax into the village treasury, were permitted to deposit their votes, though challenged by friends, and well known to the officers as not possessors of a foot of real estate.

† The Working Women's Association was organized in New York, September 17, 1868, with Mrs. Anna Tobitt, *President*: Miss Augusta Lewis, Miss Susan Johns, Miss Mary Peers. *Vice-Presidents*; Miss Elizabeth C. Browne, *Secretary*, and Miss Julia Browne, *Treasurer*. The three vice-presidents were young ladies of about twenty. Miss Lewis worked upon a newly invented type-setting machine.

Digitized by Google

proved so efficient in many cases, that it was seriously proposed to have a standing force in New York and Brooklyn, to look after young girls,* new to the temptations and dangers of city life. In *The Revolution* of March 26, 1868, we find the following:

It is often asked, would you make women police officers? It has already been done. At least a society of women exists in this country, for the discovery of crimes, conspiracies and such things. The chief of this band was Mrs. Kate Warn, a native of this State, who lately died in Chicago. She was engaged in this business, fifteen years ago, by Mr. Pinkerton, of the National Police Agency. She did good service for many years in watching, waylaying, exploring and detecting; especially on the critical occasion of President Lincoln's journey to Washington in 1861. In 1865 she was sent to New Orleans, as head of the Female Police Department there.

There was a general movement in these years for the more liberal education of women in various departments of art and industry, as well as in letters. First on the list stands Vassar College, founded in 1861, richly endowed with fine grounds and spacious buildings. We cannot estimate the civilizing influence of the thousands of young women graduating at that institution, now, as cultivated wives and mothers, presiding in households all over this land. Cornell University † was opened to girls in 1872, more richly endowed than Vassar, and in every way superior in its environments; beautifully situated on the banks of Cayuga Lake, with the added advantage and stimulus of the system of coëducation. To Andrew D. White, its president, all women owe a

* "Sergeant Robinson, of the Twenty-sixth Precinct, made a raid on the abandoned women patroling the park last evening. At 11 p. m. six unfortunates were caged." Thus runs the record. Will some one now be kind enough to tell us whether Sergeant Robinson, or any other sergeant, made a raid upon the abandoned men who were patrolling Broadway at the same hour? Did any one on that night, or, indeed, upon any other night, within the memory of the oldest Knickerbocker, make a raid upon the gamblers, thieves, drunkards and panders that infest Houston street? By what authority do the police call women "abandoned" and arrest them because they are patrolling any public park or square? If these women belonged to the class euphemistically called "unfortunate," they were doubtless there because men were already there before them. And if it was illegal in women and deserving of punishment, why should men escape? *Prima facie*, if crime were committed, the latter are the greater criminals of the two. We humbly suggest to all who are endeavoring to reform this class of women, that they turn their attention to reforming the opposite sex. If you can make men so pure that they will not seek the society of prostitutes, you will soon have no prostitutes for them to seek; in other words, prostitution will cease when men become sufficiently pure to make no demand for prostitutes. In any event, the police should treat both sexes alike. Making a raid, as it is called, upon abandoned women, and shutting them up in prison, never can procure good results. The most repulsive and bestial features of "the social evil" have their origin in the treatment that women receive at the hands of the police; and society itself would be much better if the police would keep their hands off such women.—[P. P. in *The Revolution.*

† An important decision relating to the eligibility of candidates for the Cornell free scholarship has been rendered by Judge Martin of the Supreme Court. Mary E. Wright, who stood third in the recent examination here for the scholarship, contested the appointment on the ground that the candidates who were first and second in the examination were not pupils of a school in the county. The judge decided that candidates for the position must be residents of the county and pupils of a school therein, to be eligible, and he awarded the scholarship to Miss Wright. This is the first contested scholarship since the establishment of the University.—*Ithaca dispatch to New York Times.*

Digitized by Google

debt of gratitude for his able and persevering advocacy of the benefits to both sexes, of coëducation. The university at Syracuse, in which Lima College was incorporated, is also open alike to boys and girls. Rochester University,* Brown, Columbia, Union, Hamilton, and Hobart College at Geneva, still keep their doors barred against the daughters of the State, and the three last, in the small number of their students, and their gradual decline, show the need of the very influence they exclude. Could all the girls desiring an education in and around Rochester, Geneva,† Clinton and Schenectady, enter these institutions, the added funds and enthusiasm they would thus receive would soon bring them renewed life and vigor.

Peter Cooper and Catharine Beecher's efforts for the working classes of women were equally praiseworthy. Miss Beecher formed "The American Woman's Educational Association," for the purpose of establishing schools all over the country for training girls in the rudiments of learning and practical work. The Cooper Institute, founded in 1854, by Peter Cooper, has been invaluable in its benefits to the poorer classes of girls, in giving them advantages in the arts and sciences, in evening as well as day classes. Here both boys and girls have free admission into all departments, including its valuable reading-room and library. It had long been a cherished desire of Mr. Cooper to found an institution to be devoted forever to the union of art and science in their application to the useful purposes of life. The School of Design is specially for women.

The Ladies Art Association of New York was founded in 1867, now numbering over one hundred members. One of the most important things accomplished by this society has been the preparation of thoroughly educated teachers, many of whom are now filling positions in Southern and Western colleges.

NEW YORK, June 3, 1869.

EDITORS OF THE REVOLUTION: Inclosed please find the report of a meeting of New York ladies to consider the important subject of woman's education. The within slip will show that this is a movement quite as

* Dr. Lewis H. Morgan, who died in 1882, famed in both hemispheres as an ethnologist, left a considerable estate to be devoted at the death of his wife (which has since occurred) and of his son without issue, to the establishment, in connection with the University of Rochester, of a collegiate institution for women. This makes it very probable that Rochester will ultimately offer equal opportunities to both sexes.

† At one time it was said that Hobart College had mora professors than students, and one year had arrived at such a point of exhaustion as to graduate but one young man. When the proposition to incorporate Geneva Medical College with the Syracuse University was made, Hon. George F. Comstock, a trustee of the latter institution, vigorously opposed it unless equal advantages were pledged to women.

earnest and pronounced as the woman suffrage agitation of the day, and more in consonance with prevailing public opinion. We trust that you will aid the effort by inserting the report and resolutions into your columns, and add at least a brief editorial notice.

Very respectfully, MRS. MARSHALL O. ROBERTS.

IMPORTANT MEETING OF NEW YORK LADIES.—WOMAN'S EDUCATION.—On Monday, the 31st of May, a large number of influential ladies gathered at Dr. Taylor's, corner Sixth avenue and Thirty-eighth street, in response to the call of the secretary of The American Woman's Educational Association. A meeting was organized, Mrs. Marshall O. Roberts presiding, and after a long and interesting discussion the following resolutions were unanimously passed. It is proper to state that the society has been an organized and efficient power in woman's education for over twenty years. The object of its present action is to forward a movement to secure endowed institutions for the training of women to their special duties and professions as men are trained for theirs, particularly the science and duties of home-life:

Resolved, That one cause of the depressed condition of woman is the fact that the distinctive profession of her sex, as the nurse of infancy and of the sick, as educator of childhood, and as the chief minister of the family state, has not been duly honored, nor such provision been made for its scientific and practical training as is accorded to the other sex for their professions; and that it is owing to this neglect that women are driven to seek honor and independence in the institutions and the professions of men.

Resolved, That the science of domestic economy, in its various branches, involves more important interests than any other human science; and that the evils suffered by women would be extensively remedied by establishing institutions for training woman for her profession, which shall be as generously endowed as are the institutions of men, many of which have been largely endowed by women.

Resolved, That the science of domestic economy should be made a study in all institutions for girls; and that certain practical employments of the family state should be made a part of common school education, especially the art of sewing, which is so needful for the poor; and that we will use our influence to secure these important measures.

Resolved, That every young woman should be trained to some business by which she can earn an independent livelihood in case of poverty.

Resolved, That in addition to the various in-door employments suitable for woman, there are other out-door employments especially favorable to health and equally suitable, such as raising fruits and flowers, the culture of silk and cotton, the raising of bees and the superintendence of dairy farms and manufactures. All of these offer avenues to wealth and independence for women as properly as men, and schools for imparting to women the science and practice of these employments should be provided and as liberally endowed as are the agricultural schools for men.

Resolved, That the American Woman's Educational Association is an organization which aims to secure to women these advantages, that its managers have our confidence, and that we will coöperate in its plans as far as we have opportunity.

Resolved, That the Protestant clergy would greatly aid in these efforts by preaching on the honor and duties of the family state. In order to this, we request their attention to a work just published by Miss Beecher and Mrs. Stowe, entitled "The American Woman's Home," which largely discusses many important topics of this general subject, while the authors have devoted most of their profits from this work to promote the plans of the American Woman's Educational Association.

Digitized by Google

Resolved, That editors of the religious and secular press will contribute important aid to an effort they must all approve by inserting these resolutions in their columns.

Among the influences that brought new thought to the question of woman suffrage was the establishment of *The Revolution* in 1868. Radical and defiant in tone, it awoke friends and foes alike to action. Some denounced it, some ridiculed it, but all read it. It needed just such clarion notes sounded forth long and loud each week to rouse the friends of the movement from the apathy into which they had fallen after the war. One cannot read its glowing pages to-day without appreciating the power it was just at that crisis.*

Miss Lucy B. Hobbs of New York was the first woman that ever graduated in the profession of dentistry. She matriculated in the Cincinnati Dental College in the fall of 1864—passing through a full course of study, missing but two lectures, and those at the request of the professor of anatomy. She graduated from that institution in February, 1866. A letter from the dean of the college testifies to her worth as follows:

She was a woman of great energy and perseverance. Studious in her habits, modest and unassuming, she had the respect and kind regard of every member of the class and faculty. As an operator she was not surpassed by her associates. Her opinion was asked and her assistance sought in difficult cases almost daily by her fellow-students. And though the class of which she was a member was one of the largest ever in attendance, it excelled all previous ones in good order and decorum—a condition largely due to the presence of a lady. In the final examination she was second to none.

Having received her diploma, she opened an office in Iowa; from thence she removed to Chicago, and practiced successfully. The following letter from Mrs. Taylor (formerly Miss Hobbs) gives further interesting details. Writing to Matilda Joslyn Gage, she says:

I am grateful to you for giving me the opportunity to place in history the fact of my study of dentistry. I was born in Franklin county, New York, in 1833. You ask my reason for entering the profession. It was to be independent. I first studied medicine, but did not like the practice. My preceptor, Professor Cleveland, advised me to try dentistry, and I commenced with Dr. Samuel Warde of Cincinnati, finishing my studies in March, 1861. At that time the faculty of the Ohio Dental College would not permit me to attend, and there was not a college in the United States that would admit me, and no amount of persuasion could change their

* See Volume II., page 264.

Digitized by Google

minds. So far as I know, I was the first woman who had ever taken instruction of a private tutor.

I went to Iowa to commence practice, and was so successful that the dentists of the State insisted I should be allowed to attend the college. Their efforts prevailed, and I graduated from the Ohio Dental College at Cincinnati in the spring of 1866—the first woman in the world to take a diploma from a dental college. I am a New-Yorker by birth, but I love my adopted country—the West. To it belongs the credit of making it possible for women to be recognized in the dental profession on equal terms with men. Should you wish any further proof, write to Dr. Watt, who was professor of chemistry at the time I graduated, and I know he will take pleasure in giving you any additional information.

As early as 1866 a system of safe-deposit companies was inaugurated in New York, which has proved a boon to women, enabling them to keep any private papers they may wish to preserve. In 1880, we find the following in the *National Citizen:*

A ladies' exchange for railroad and mining stocks has been started at 71 Broadway, New York. The rooms are provided with an indicator, desks and such other conveniences as are required for business. Messenger boys drop in and out, and a telephone connects with the office of a prominent Wall-street brokerage firm. Miss Mary E. Gage, daughter of Frances Dana Gage, is the manager and proprietor of the business. In reply to the inquiries of a *Graphic* reporter, Miss Gage said she had found so much inconvenience and annoyance in transacting her own operations in stocks that she concluded to establish an office. After Miss Gage was fairly settled, other women who labored under the same disadvantages, began to drop in, their number increasing daily. A ladies' stock exchange also exists at No. 40 Fourth street, under charge of Mrs. Favor. The banking houses of Henry Clews and the wealthy Russell Sage are said to be working in union with this exchange. In January we chronicled the formation of a woman's mining company and this month of a woman's stock exchange, each of them an evidence of the wide range of business women are entering.

In *The Revolution* of May 14, 1868, we find the following:

SOROSIS.—This is the name of a new club of literary women, who meet once a month and lunch at Delmonico's, to discuss questions of art, science, literature and government. Alice Carey, who is president, in her opening speech states the object of the club, which is summed up in this brief extract:

We have proposed the inculcation of deeper and broader ideas among women, proposed to teach them to think for themselves and get their opinions at first hand, not so much because it is their right as because it is their duty. We have also proposed to open new avenues of employment to women—to make them less dependent and less burdensome—to lift them out of unwomanly self-distrust and disqualifying diffidence into womanly self-respect and self-knowledge. To teach them to make all work honorable, by each doing the share that falls to her, or that she may work out to herself agreeably to her own special aptitude, cheerfully and faithfully—not going down to it, but bringing it up to her. We have proposed to enter our protest against all idle

Digitized by Google

gossip, against all demoralizing and wicked waste of time, also, against the follies and the tyrannies of fashion, against all external impositions and disabilities; in short, against each and every thing that opposes the full development and use of the faculties conferred upon us by our Creator.

We most heartily welcome all movements for the cultivation of individual thought and character in woman, and would recommend the formarion of such clubs throughout the country. The editors of the New York press have made known their dissatisfaction that no gentlemen were to be admitted into this charmed circle. After a calm and dispassionate discussion of this question, it was decided to exclude gentlemen, not because their society was not most desirable and calculated to add brilliancy to the club, but from a fear lest the natural reverence of woman for man might embarrass her in beginning to reason and discuss; lest she should be awed to silence by their superior presence. It was not because they love man less, but their own improvement more. For the comfort of these ostracised ones, we would suggest a hope for the future. After these ladies become familiar with parliamentary tactics, and the grave questions that are to come before them for consideration, it is proposed to admit gentlemen to the galleries, that they may enjoy the same privileges vouchsafed to the fair sex in the past, to look down upon the feast, to listen to the speeches, and to hear "the pale, thoughtful brow," "the silken moustache," "the flowing locks," "the manly gait and form" toasted in prose and verse.

This club has met regularly ever since the day of its inauguration, and has been remarkable for the harmony maintained by its members. Mrs. Charlotte Wilbour was president for several years, until she went to reside in Paris, in 1874. Since that time Mrs. Croly has been, from year to year, elected to that office. Beginning with 12 members,* this club now numbers 320.

The most respected live-stock reporter in New York is a woman, Miss Middie Morgan, pronounced the best judge of horned cattle in this country. She can tell the weight of a beef on foot at a glance, and reports the cattle market for the New York *Times*. A correspondent says:

Her father was a cattle-dealer, and taught her to handle fearlessly the animals he delighted in. She learned to tell at a glance the finest points of live-stock, and to doctor bovine and equine ailments with the utmost skill. With all this, she became a proficient in Italian and French, and a terse and rapid writer. A few years ago, after her father's death, she traveled in Italy with an invalid sister, having an eye to her pet passion—the horse. While there she met Prince Poniatowsky, also an ardent admirer of that animal. He mentioned her zoölogical accomplishments to Victor Emanuel, and the consequence was Miss Middie was deputed by His

* The twelve were: Mrs. H. M. Field, Mrs. Anna Lynch Botta, Miss Kate Field, Mrs. Anna B. Allen, Miss Josephine Pollard, Mrs. Celia Burleigh, Mrs. Fanny Barrow, Mrs. C. B. Wilbour, Mrs. J. C. Croly, Miss Ella Dietz, Alice and Phebe Cary.

Digitized by Google

Majesty to purchase a hundred or so of fine horses. She had charge of the blood-horses of King Victor Emanuel, who owns the finest stud in Europe, and breeds horses of a superior shape, vigor and fire. He beats Grant in his admiration for that noble animal. When she decided to come to this country, she made known the fact to Hon. George P. Marsh, our minister to Italy; and he gave her a letter of recommendation to Mr. Bigelow, of the *Times*, who employed her. She is an expert among all kinds of animals. Her judgment about the different breeds is sought after and much quoted. She can discuss the nice points about cattle as easily as Rosa Bonheur can paint them.*

From the Woman's Journal, Oct. 1, 1870:

Miss Barkaloo, the lady just admitted to the St. Louis bar as a lawyer, and who has received a license to practice as attorney-at-law from the Supreme Court of that State, is a native of Brooklyn, N. Y., and is a woman of more than ordinary ability. Two years ago, after having read Blackstone and other elementary law-books, she made application for admission as a student at Columbia College, New York, and was promptly refused. Nothing daunted, she went to St. Louis, where she was admitted to the Law School. For eighteen months she assiduously devoted her energies to the study of the science, and her fellow-students all agreed in declaring her by far the brightest member of the class. That there was no question of her ability was clearly shown at her examination. Judge Knight, although overflowing with gallantry, gave the lady no quarter. The most abstruse and erudite questions were propounded to the applicant, but not once did the judge catch the fair student tripping. Miss Barkaloo was about 22 years of age, of a fine figure, intelligent face and large, expressive eyes. The St. Louis papers of last week reported her sudden death of typhoid fever. According to custom, a meeting of the members of the St. Louis bar was held to take suitable action and pay respect to her memory. It was the first meeting of the kind in the United States, and was largely attended, not only by the young members of the bar, but by the most distinguished attorneys. Miss Phœbe Couzins, herself a member of the Law School, was in attendance, attired in deep mourning for the recent death of a beloved sister. The following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That in the death of Miss Helena Barkaloo we deplore the loss of the first of her sex ever admitted to the bar of Missouri.

Resolved, That in her erudition, industry and enterprise we have to regret the loss of one who, in the morning of her career, bade fair to reflect credit on our profession, and a new honor upon her sex.

Resolved, That our sympathy and condolence be extended to the relatives of the deceased.

Major Lucien Eaton, into whose office she had entered to seek opportunities of perfecting herself in the knowledge of her profession, said that—

He had been requested by an accomplished lady of St. Louis to afford her that opportunity, and at first had hesitated to do so; yet he felt that she should have a trial,

* She now reports the cattle-market for four New York papers including the *Tribune* and *Times*.

Digitized by Google

and when he took her into his office his conduct met with the approbation of the legal fraternity generally. That fraternity cordially sympathized with the efforts she was making, and both old lawyers and young ones tried to put business into her hands, the taking of depositions and other such work as she could perform. He testified to finding her a true woman; modest and retiring, carefully shunning all unnecessary publicity, and avoiding all display. She was earnest in her studies, and being gifted with a fine intellect and a good judgment, gave promise of great attainments. He had never known a student more assiduous in study; she wanted to become mistress of her profession. Her death is a calamity, not to her friends alone, but to all who are making an effort for the enlargement of woman's sphere.

After the closing of the doors of the Geneva Medical School to women, the Central Medical College of Syracuse was the first to admit them. Four were graduated in 1852. Since then the two medical colleges in New York city have graduated hundreds of women. Among the many in successful practice are Clemence S. Lozier, Emily Blackwell, Mary Putnam Jacobi, New York; Eliza P. Mosher, Brooklyn; Sarah R. A. Dolley, Anna H. Searing, Fannie F. Hamilton, Rochester; Amanda B. Sanford, Auburn; Eveline P. Ballintine, Le Roy; Rachel E. Gleason, Elmira.

In May, 1870, the New York City Society was formed, with efficient officers,* and pleasant rooms, at 16 Union Square, where meetings were regularly held on Friday afternoon of each week. These meetings were well attended and sustained with increasing interest from month to month. This society held its first meeting November 27, 1871, which was addressed by Mrs. Julia Ward Howe; and on January 13, 1872, another, addressed by Jennie Collins, the indefatigable Bostonian who has done so much for the benefit of the working girls. A series of meetings was held under the auspices of this association in many of the chief cities around New York and on the Hudson, the chief speakers being the officers of the association. An active German society was soon after formed, with Mrs. Augusta Lillienthal, president, and Mrs. Matilda F. Wendt, secretary. The latter published a paper, *Die Neue Zeit*, devoted to woman suffrage. She was also the correspondent of several leading journals in Germany. The society held its first public meeting March 21, 1872, in Turner Hall, Mrs. Wendt presiding. Mrs. Lillienthal, Mrs. Clara Neyman and Dr. Adolphe Doney were the speakers. Clara Neyman became afterwards a popular speaker in many suffrage and free-religious associations.

Petitions were rolled up by both the German and American societies to the legislature, praying for the right of suffrage, and

* *President*, Charlotte B. Wilbour; *Vice-Presidents*, Dr. Clemence S. Lozier, Mrs. Devereux Blake; *Secretary*, Frances V. Hallock; *Treasurer*, Miss Jeannie McAdam.

on April 3, 1871, the petitioners* were granted a hearing, before the Judiciary Committee of the Assembly, Hon. L. Bradford Prince presiding. Mrs. Wilbour's able address made a most favorable impression. The question was referred to the Judiciary Committee. The majority report was adverse, the minority, signed by Robert A. Strahan and C. P. Vedder, favorable.

A grand demonstration was made April 26, 1872, in Cooper Institute, intended specially to emphasize the claims of wives and mothers to the ballot, and to show that the City Association had no sympathy with any theories of free-love. Five thousand cards of invitation were distributed.

In 1871 women attempted to vote in different parts of the State, among whom were Matilda Joslyn Gage at Fayetteville, and Mrs. Louise Mansfield at Nyack, but were repulsed. In 1872 others did vote under the fourteenth amendment, conspicuously Susan B. Anthony, who, as an example for the rest, was arrested, tried, convicted and fined.† Mrs. Gage published a woman's rights catechism to answer objections made at that time to woman's voting, which proved a valuable campaign document. We find the names of Mary R. Pell of Flushing, Helen M. Loder of Poughkeepsie, and Elizabeth B. Whitney of Harlem, frequently mentioned at this time for their valuable services.

The following items show the varied capacity of women for many employments:

In March, 1872, Miss Charlotte E. Ray (colored) of New York, was graduated at the Howard University Law School, and admitted to practice in the courts of the District of Columbia at Washington.——The headquarters of the Women's National Relief Association is in New York; its object is supplying government stations along the coast with beds, blankets, warm clothing and other necessaries for shipwrecked persons. ——Miss Leggett, for a long time proprietor of a book and paper store in New York, established a home, in 1878, for women, on Clinton Square, which is in all respects antipodal to Stewart's Hotel. It is governed by no stringent rules or regulations. No woman is liable without cause, at the mere caprice of the founder, to be suddenly required to leave, as was the case in Judge Hilton's home. On the contrary, it is the object of the founder to provide a *real* home for women. The house is not only provided with a library, piano, etc., but its inmates are allowed to bring their sewing-machines, hang pictures upon the walls, put up private book-racks, etc. The price, too, but $4 a week, falls more nearly within

* The petitioners were represented by Mrs. Wilbour, Mrs. Hester M. Poole, Elizabeth B. Phelps, Elizabeth Langdon, Mrs. I. D. Hull, Mrs. Charlotte L. Coleman, Mrs. M. E. Leclover, Matilda Joslyn Gage.

† See Vol. II., page 628.

the means of laboring women than the $6 to $10 of the Stewart Hotel.——The first penny lunch-room in New York was established by a woman, who made it a source of revenue.——The inventor of the submarine telescope, a woman, has received $10,000 for her invention.——Deborah Powers, now over ninety years of age, is the head of a large oil-cloth manufactory in Troy. Her sons are engaged in business with her, but she, still bright and active, remains at the head of the firm. This is the largest oil-cloth factory in the United States. She was left a widow with three sons, with a heavy mortgage on her estate. She secured an extension of time, built up the business and educated her sons to the work. She is also president of a bank.——A successful nautical school in New York is conducted by two ladies, Mrs. Thorne and her daughter, Mrs. Brownlow. These ladies have made several voyages and studied navigation, both theoretically and practically. During the late war they prepared for the navy 2,000 mates and captains bringing their knowledge of navigation up to the standard required by the strict examiners of the naval board.——Mrs. Wilson, since a New York custom-house inspector, took charge, in 1872, of her husband's ship, disabled in a terrific gale off Newfoundland in which his collar-bone was broken and a portion of the crew badly hurt. The main-mast having been cut down she rigged a jury-mast, and after twenty-one days brought ship and crew safe to port.

Miss Jennie Turner, a short-hand writer of New York, is a notary public. In a recent law-suit some of the papers were "sworn to" before her in her official capacity, and one of the attorneys claimed that it was not verified, inasmuch as a woman "could not legally hold public office." The judge decided that the paper must be accepted as properly verified, and said that the only way to oust her was in a direct action by the attorney-general. The judge said:

Whether a female is capable of holding public office has never been decided by the courts of this State, and is a question about which legal minds may well differ. The constitution regulates the right of suffrage and limits it to "male" citizens. Disabilities are not favored, and are seldom extended by implication, from which it may be argued that if it required the insertion of the term "male" to exclude female citizens of lawful age from the right of suffrage, a similar limitation would be required to disqualify them from holding office. Citizenship is a condition or status and has no relation to age or sex. It may be contended that it was left to the good sense of the executive and to the electors to determine whether or not they would select females to office, and that the power being lodged in safe hands was beyond the danger of abuse. If, on the other hand, it be seriously contended that the constitution, by necessary implication, disqualifies females from holding office, it must follow as a necessary consequence that the act of the legislature permitting females to serve as school officers, and all other legislative enactments of like import removing such disqualification, are unconstitutional and void. In this same connection it may be argued that if the use of the personal pronoun "he" in the constitution does not exclude females from public office, its use in the statute can have no greater effect. The statute, like the constitution, in prescribing the qualifications for office, omits the word "male," leaving the question whether female citizens of lawful age are included or excluded, one of construction.

Miss Anna Ballard, a reporter on the staff of the New York *Sun*, was elected a member of the Press Club, in 1877, by a vote of 24 to 10. Within

Digitized by Google

the last ten years women contributors to the press have become numerous. The book-reviewer of the *Herald* is a woman; one of the book-reviewers of the *Tribune*, one of its most valued correspondents and several of its regular contributors are women; the agricultural and market reporter of the New York *Times* is a woman; the New York *Sun's* fashion writer is a woman, and also one of its most industrious and sagacious reporters. Female correspondents flood the evening papers with news from Washington. We instance these not at all as a complete catalogue; for there are, we doubt not, more than a hundred women known and recognized in and about Printing-house Square as regular contributors to the columns of the daily and weekly press. As a rule they are modest, reputable pains-taking servants of the press; and it is generally conceded that if they are willing to put up with the inconveniences attending journalistic work, it is no part of men's duty to interfere with their attempt to earn an honest livelihood in a profession which has so many avenues as yet uncrowded. Miss Ellen A. Martin, formerly of Jamestown, N. Y., a graduate of the Law School of Ann Arbor, in 1875, was admitted to the bar by the Supreme Court of Illinois, at the January term, and is practicing in Chicago, occupying an office with Miss Perry, Room 39, No. 143 La Salle street. Mrs. Martha J. Lamb was the first woman ever admitted to membership in the New York State Historical Society. Her "History of New York City" is recognized as a standard authority, and has already taken rank among the great histories of the world.

During the summer of 1872 the presidential campaign agitated the country. As Horace Greeley, who was opposed to woman suffrage, was running against Grant and Wilson, who were in favor, and as the Republican platform contained a plank promising some consideration for the loyal women of the nation, a great demonstration was held in Cooper Institute, New York, October 7. The large hall was crowded by an excited throng. Hon. Luther R. Marsh presided. The speakers* were all unusually happy. Mrs. Blake's† address was applauded to a

* Isabella Beecher Hooker, Susan B. Anthony, Rev. Olympia Brown, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Dr. Clemence Lozier, Helen M. Slocum, Lillie Devereux Blake.

† Lillie Devereux Blake was born in Raleigh, North Carolina, in August, 1833. Her father, George Devereux, was a wealthy Southern gentleman of Irish descent. Her mother's maiden name was Sarah Elizabeth Johnson of Stratford, Connecticut, a descendant of William Samuel Johnson who was one of the first two senators from that State. Both her parents were descended from Jonathan Edwards. Her father died in 1837, and the widow subsequently removed to New Haven, Conn., where she was well known for her large and generous hospitality. Her daughter, the future favorite writer and lecturer, was a much admired belle, and in 1855 was married to Frank Umsted, a lawyer of Philadelphia, with whom she lived two years in St. Louis, Mo. Mr. Umsted died in 1859, and his widow, who had written sketches for *Harper's Magazine* and published a novel called "Southwold," from that date contributed largely to leading newspapers and magazines. She was Washington correspondent of the *Evening Post* in the winter of 1861, published "Rockford" in 1862, and wrote many stories for *Frank Leslie's Weekly*, the *Philadelphia Press* and other publications. In 1866 she married Greenfill Blake of New York. In 1872 Mrs. Blake published "Fettered for Life," a novel designed to show the legal disadvantages of women. Ever since she became interested in the suffrage movement Mrs. Blake has been one of the most ardent advocates. She has taken several lecturing tours in different States of the Union. Mrs. Blake is an easy speaker and writer, and of late has contributed to many of our popular magazines. Much of the recent work in the New York legislature is due to her untiring zeal.

Digitized by Google

recall, when she went forward and asked the audience to give three cheers for the woman suffrage candidates, Grant and Wilson, which they did with hearty good will.

During the winter of 1873 a commission was sitting at Albany to revise the constitution of New York. As it seemed fitting that women should press their claims to the ballot, memorials were presented and hearings requested by both the State and City societies. Accordingly Mr. Silliman, the chairman, appointed February 18, to hear the memorialists. A large delegation of ladies went from New York.* The commission was holding its sessions in the common-council chamber, and when the time arrived for the hearing the room was crowded with an attentive audience. The members of the Committee on Suffrage were all present, Mr. Silliman presided. Matilda Joslyn Gage represented the State association, speaking upon the origin of government and the rights pertaining thereto. Mrs. Wilbour and Mrs. Blake represented the New York City Society, and each alike made a favorable impression. The Albany *Evening Journal* gave a large space to a description of the occasion. The respectful hearing, however, was the beginning and the end, as far as could be seen, of all impression made on the committee, which coolly recommended that suffrage be secured to colored men by ratifying the fifteenth amendment, while making no recognition whatever of the women of the State. A memorial was at once sent to the legislature and another hearing was granted on February 27. Mrs. Blake † was the only speaker on that occasion. The Hon. Bradford Prince, of Queens, presided. At the close of Mrs. Blake's remarks James W. Husted of Westchester, in a few earnest words, avowed himself henceforth a champion of the cause. Shortly afterwards the Hon. George West presented a constitutional amendment giving to every woman possessed of $250 the right to vote, thus placing the women of the State in the same position with the colored men before the passage of the fifteenth amendment; but even this was denied. The amendment was referred to the Judiciary Committee and there entombed. Large

* Mrs. Jennie McAdam, Mrs. Hester Poole, Charlotte Coleman, Mrs. Hull, Mrs. Morse and others. A month before, January 23, Miss Anthony was invited to address the commission, giving her constitutional argument, showing woman's right to vote under the fourteenth amendment. Hon. Henry R. Selden was in the audience, being in the city on Miss Anthony's case. At the close of her argument he said: "If I had heard that speech before, I could have made a stronger plea before Judge Hall this morning."

† She was escorted to the capitol by Phœbe H. Jones and the venerable Lydia Mott, who for a quarter of a century had entertained at their respective homes the various speakers that had come to Albany to plead for new liberties, and had accompanied them, one after another, to the halls of legislation.

Digitized by Google

meetings* were held at Robinson Hall during the winter, and at Apollo Hall in May, and in different localities about New York.

July 2, 1873, an indignation meeting was held by the City Society to protest against the sentence pronounced by Judge Hunt in the case of Susan B. Anthony. De Garmo Hall was crowded. The platform was decorated with the United States flag draped with black bunting, while on each side were banners, one bearing the inscription, "Respectful Consideration for a Loyal Woman's Vote! $100 Fine!" the other, "Shall One Federal Judge Abolish Trial by Jury?" Dr. Clemence Lozier presided, and Mrs. Devereux Blake made a stirring speech reviewing Miss Anthony's trial and Judge Hunt's decision.† Mr. Hamilton Wilcox made a manly protest against Judge Hunt's high-handed act of oppression, and Mrs. Marie Rachel made another, in behalf of the German association.

In October, 1873, Mrs. Devereux Blake made an effort to open the doors of Columbia College to women. A class of four young ladies‡ united in asking admission. Taking them with her, Mrs. Blake went before the president and faculty, who gave her a respectful hearing. She argued that the charter of the college itself declared that it was founded for "the education of the youth of the city, and that the word *youth* was defined in all dictionaries as "young persons of both sexes," so that by its very foundation it was intended that girls as well as boys should enjoy the benefits of the university, and it was no more than just that they should, seeing that the original endowment was by the "rectors and inhabitants of the city of New York," one-half of these inhabitants being women. Mrs. Blake's§ application was referred to "the Committee on the Course of Instruction," and after some weeks of consideration was refused, on the ground that "it was inexpedient," the Rev. Morgan Dix being especially

* Addressed by Mrs. Wilbour, Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Lozier, Mrs. Hallock, Hamilton Wilcox and Dr. Hallock.

† For Judge Hunt's decision, see Volume II., page 677.

‡ Miss Charlotte C. Jackson, the valedictorian of the Normal College of New York; Miss Mary Hussey of Orange, New Jersey, Miss Mosher of Ann Arbor, Michigan; Miss Emma Wendt, daughter of Mathilde Wendt. In 1867, Mrs. Stanton had made a similar application to Theodore D. Dwight, that the law school might be opened to young women. In the course of their conversation Professor Dwight said: "Do you think girls know enough to study law?" Mrs. Stanton replied: "All the liberal laws for women that have been passed in the last twenty years are the results of the protests of women; surely, if they know enough to protest against bad laws, they know enough to study our whole system of jurisprudence."

§ It was peculiarly fitting that this application should be made by Mrs. Blake, as two of her ancestors had been presidents of the college. The first it ever had, when founded as King's College in 1700, was the Rev. Samuel Johnson, D. D., her great-great-grandfather. His son, the Hon. Samuel William Johnson, was the first president after the Revolution, when the name was changed to Columbia College.

Digitized by Google

active in his opposition. However, soon after this, the lectures of the college were open to ladies, and a few years later President Barnard warmly recommended that young women should be admitted as students to all the privileges of the university.

A Woman's Congress was organized at New York, October 15, 16, 17, 1873, in the Union League Theater. Representative women * were there from all parts of the country. Its object was similar to the social science organizations—the discussion of a wider range of subjects than could be tolerated on the platforms of any specific reform. Mary A. Livermore presided, and the meeting was considered a great success. The speeches and proceedings were published in pamphlet form, and still are from year to year. This had been an idea long brewing in many minds, and was at last realized through the organizing talent of Mrs. Charlotte B. Wilbour, the originator of Sorosis. From year to year they have held regular meetings in the chief cities of the different States.

Dr. Clemence Lozier,† president of the city society, early opened her spacious parlors to the monthly meetings, where they have been held for many years. This association has been active and vigilant, taking note of and furthering every step of progress in Church and State. Mrs. Lozier and Mrs. Blake have worked most effectively together, the former furnishing the sinews of war, and the latter making the attack all along the line, to the terror of the faint-hearted.

The era of centennial celebrations was now approaching, and it was proposed to hold a suitable commemoration on the one-hundredth anniversary of the Boston tea-party, December 16, 1873. Union League Theater was, on the appointed evening, filled to its utmost capacity. The platform was decorated with

* Julia Ward Howe, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Antoinette Brown Blackwell, Mary F. Eastman, Helen Potter, Sarah Andrews Spencer, Augusta Cooper Bristol, Alice Fletcher, Maria Mitchell, professor at Vassar College, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Frances Ellen Burr, Abby Smith, Rossella E. Buckingham, and others.

† Dr. Clemence Lozier was born of a good family in New Jersey. She was married at the early age of 16, and widowed at 27, left with a young family without means of support. But being an excellent teacher, she soon found employment. For eleven years she was principal of a young ladies' seminary. By natural instinct a physician and a healer, she determined to fit herself for that profession. A physician of the old school assisted her in her medical studies, and in 1853 she received a diploma from the Eclectic College of Syracuse, and shortly after established herself in New York, where her practice steadily increased, until her professional income was one of the largest in the city. In 1860 she began a course of free medical lectures to women, which continued for three years, culminating in "The New York Medical College for Women," which was chartered in 1863. The foundation and establishment of this institution was the crowning work of her life, to which she has devoted time and money. From the first she has been dean of the faculty, and after years of struggle at last has the satisfaction of seeing it a complete success, owning a fine building up town, with hospital and dispensary attached.

Digitized by Google

flowers and filled with ladies, Dr. Lozier presiding. Miss Anthony was the speaker of the evening, and made a most effective address; Helen Potter gave a recitation; Hannah M'L. Shepherd read letters of sympathy; Mrs. Blake made a short closing address, and presented a series of resolutions, couched in precisely the same language as that adopted by our ancestors in protesting against taxation without representation:

Resolved, That as an expression of the sentiments of the tax-paying women of New York, we reiterate, as applied to ourselves, the declaration contained in the bill of rights put forth by our ancestors 100 years ago: *First*—That the women of the country are entitled to equal rights and privileges with the men; *Second*—That it is inseparably essential to the freedom of a people, and the undoubted right of all men and women, that no taxes be imposed on them but by their own consent, given in person or by their representatives; *Third*—That the only representatives of these women are persons chosen by themselves, and that no taxes ever have been or can be constitutionally imposed upon them but by legislatures composed of persons so chosen.

The report of the State assessors * of 1883 brought forcibly to view the injustice done in taxing non-voters. At their meeting with the supervisors of Onondaga county, Mr. Pope of Fabius said: "Mrs. Andrews is assessed too much." Mr. Hadley replied: "Well, Mr. Briggs says that is the way all the women are assessed." Mr. Briggs responded: "Yes, that is the way we find the assessors treat the women; they can't vote, you know! I am in favor of letting the women vote now."

Two women in the village of Batavia were assessed for more personal property than the entire assessment of like property, exclusive of corporations, in the city of Rochester with a population of 70,000! While declaring they had found very little personal property assessed, Mr. Fowler said: "We found some cases where town assessors had taxed the personal property of women,

* Several ladies appeared last week before the New York Supervisors' Committee to protest against excessive taxation. The New York *World* informs us that Mrs. Harriet Ramsen complained that the appraisement of lot 5 West One Hundred and Twenty-second street, was increased from $7,000 to $9,000. Mrs. P. P. Dickinson, house 48 West Fifty-sixth street, increased from $15,000 to $20,000; Mrs. Cynthia Bunce, house 37 West Fifty-fourth street, last year's valuation $10,000; this year's, $15,000. Mrs. Daly, who owns a house in Seventy-second street, informed the committee that the assessment on the house (a small dwelling) was put at $2,000, an increase of $700 over last year's valuation. This house stands in an unopened street. Supervisor McCafferty said that the committee would do all in its power to have the assessment reduced, and also remarked that it was a positive outrage to assess such a small house at so high a figure. Mrs. Louisa St. John, who is reputed to be worth $2,000,000, complained because three lots on Fifth avenue, near Eighty-sixth street, and five lots on the last-named street, have been assessed at much higher figures than other lots in the neighborhood. Mrs. St. John addressed the committee with much eloquence and force. Said she: "I do not complain of the assessments that have been laid on my property. I complain of the inequalities practiced by the assessors, and I should like to see them set right." Supervisor McCafferty assured Mrs. St. John that everything in the power of the committee would be done to equalize assessments in future. Mrs. St. John is a heavy speculator in real estate. She attends sales and has property "knocked down" to her. She makes all her own searches in the register's office, and is known, in fact, among property-owners as a very thorough real-estate lawyer. Many years ago she was the proprietor of the Globe Hotel, now Frankfort House, corner of Frankfort and William streets.

Digitized by Google

and one case of a ward who was assessed to full value, while upon the guardian's property there was no assessment at all." This report not only proved a good woman suffrage document, but the work done by the State assessors, Messrs. Hadley, Briggs and Fowler, convinced them personally of woman's need of the ballot for the protection of her property.

Early in the year 1874, memorials from societies in different parts of the State were sent to the legislature, asking "that all taxes due from women be remitted until they are allowed to vote." The most active of these anti-tax societies was the one formed in Rochester through the efforts of Mrs. Lewia C. Smith, whose earnestness and fidelity in this, as in many another good word and work, have been such as to command the admiration even of opponents—a soul of that sweet charity that makes no account of self. A hearing was appointed for the memorialists on January 24, and the journals * made honorable mention of the occasion.

The centennial was approaching and the notes of preparation were heard on all sides. The women who understood their status as disfranchised citizens in a republic, regarded the coming event as one for them of humiliation rather than rejoicing, inasmuch as the close of the first century of the nation's existence found one half the people still political slaves. At the February meeting of the association, Mrs. Blake presented the following resolution:

Resolved, That the members of this society do hereby pledge themselves not to aid either by their labor, time or money, the proposed celebration of the independence of the men of the nation, unless before July 4, 1876, the women of the land shall be guaranteed their political freedom.

---

* The Albany *Evening Journal* of January 22 said: A hearing was granted by the Judiciary Committee to-night, on the petition of the Woman's Tax-payers Association of the City of Rochester, for either representation or relief from taxation. The petitioners were heard in the assembly chamber, and in addition to members of the committee, a large audience of ladies and gentlemen were drawn together, including the president of the Senate, speaker of the House, and nearly all the leading members of both branches of the legislature. The first speaker was Mrs. Blake, the youngest of the trio, who occupied about twenty minutes and was well received. She was followed by Miss Anthony, who made a telling speech, frequently eliciting applause. She recounted her long service in the woman's rights cause, and gave a brief history of the different enactments and repeals on the question for the last thirty years. She related her experience in voting, and said she was fined $100 and costs, one cent of which she had never paid and never meant to. She claimed Judge Waite was in favor of woman suffrage, and believed the present speaker of the Assembly of New York was also in favor of the movement. Calls being made for General Husted, that gentleman replied that Miss Anthony was perfectly correct in her statement. She summed up by asking the committee to report in favor of legislation exempting women from taxation unless represented by the ballot, remarking that she would not ask for the right to vote, as that was guaranteed her by the Constitution of the United States. Miss Anthony then introduced Mrs. Joslyn Gage, who said if any member of the committee had objections to offer or questions to ask she would like the privilege of answering; but as none of the committee availed themselves, she proceeded for fifteen minutes in about the same strain as her predecessors. Calls being made for Mr. Spencer and eliciting no reply from that gentleman, Mrs. Blake said they should consider him a convert.

Digitized by Google

In their own way, however, the members of the society intended to observe such centennials as were fitting, and so preparation was made for a suitable commemoration of the battle of Lexington. They held a meeting* in the Union League Theatre, the evening of April 19, to protest against their disfranchisement. The journals contained fair reports, with the exception of *The Tribune*, which sent no reporter, and closed its account next day of many observances elsewhere by saying, "there was no celebration in New York city." Several of the papers published Mrs Blake's speech:

Just as the first rays of dawn stole across our city this morning, the century was complete since the founders of this nation made their first great stand for liberty. The early April sunshine a hundred years ago saw a group of men and boys gathered together, "a few rods north of the meeting-house," in the Massachusetts village of Lexington. Un-uniformed and undisciplined, standing in the chilly morning, that handful of patriots represented the great Republic which on that day was to spring from their martyrdom. The rebellious colonists had collected in the hamlets near Boston some military stores; these the British officers in command at Boston resolved should be seized and destroyed. Warned of their design Paul Revere made his famous ride to arouse the country to resistance, and in the dead of night Adams and Hancock went out to summon their comrades to arms. As the last stars vanished before the dawn, the drum beat to summon the patriots to action, and in response a little band of about eighty men and boys assembled on the village green. Few as they were in numbers, they presented a brave front as the British regulars came up the quiet street, 200 strong. What followed was not a battle, but a butchery. The minute-men refused to surrender to Major Pitcairn's haughty demand, and a volley of musketry, close and deadly, was poured on this devoted band. In response only a few random shots were fired, which did absolutely no harm, and then, seeing the hopelessness of resistance, the commander of the minute-men ordered them to disperse. The British, elated with their easy victory, pushed on toward Concord, thinking that there another speedy success awaited them. In this they soon bitterly learned their error. Although they were reinforced on the way, when they reached that village they were met by such a resistance as drove them back, broken and disorganized, on the road they had so proudly followed in the morning. Concord nobly avenged the slaughter at Lexington.

So much for what men did on that day, and let us see what share the women had in its dangers and its sorrows. Jonathan Harris was shot in front of his own house, while his wife was watching him from a window, seeing him fall with such anguish as no poor words of mine can describe. He struggled to his feet, the blood gushing from a wound in his breast, staggered forward a few paces and fell again, and then crawled on his hands and knees to his threshold only to expire just as his wife reached him. Did not this woman bear her portion of the martyrdom? Isaac Davis, a man in the prime of life, went forth from his home in the morning, and before the afternoon sunlight had grown yellow, was brought back to it dead, and was laid, pale and cold, in his wife's bed, only three hours after he had left her with a solemn benediction of farewell. Did not this woman also suffer? She was left a widow in the very flower of her youth, and for seventy years she faithfully mourned his taking off! Nor were these the only ones; for every man who fell that day, some woman's heart was wrung. There were others who endured actual physical hardship and suffering. Hannah Adams lay in bed with an infant only a week old when the British reached her house in their disorderly

* The speakers were Dr. Clemence Lozier, Helen M. Slocum, Henrietta Westbrook, Mrs. Devereux Blake. Mrs. J. E. Frobisher recited Paul Revere's ride, and Helen M. Cooke read the resolutions.

Digitized by Google

retreat to Boston; they forced her to leave her sick room and to crawl into an adjoining corn shed, while they burned her house to ashes in her sight. Three companies of British troops went to the house of Major Barrett and demanded food. Mrs. Barrett served them as well as she was able, and when she was offered compensation, refused it, saying gently, "We are commanded if our enemy hunger to feed him." So, in toil or suffering or anguish the women endured their share of the sorrows of that day. Do they not deserve a share of its glories also? The battles of Lexington and Concord form an era in our country's history. When, driven to desperation by a long course of oppression, the people first resolved to revolt against the mother country. Discontent, resentment and indignation had grown stronger month by month among the hardy settlers of the land, until they culminated in the most splendid act of audacity that the world has ever seen. A few colonies, scattered at long intervals along the Atlantic seaboard, dared to defy the proudest nation in Europe, and a few rustics, undisciplined, and almost unarmed, actually ventured to encounter in battle that army which had boasted its conquests over the flower of European chivalry. What unheard of oppressions drove these people to the mad attempt? What unheard of atrocities had the rulers of these people practiced, what unjust confiscations of property, what cruel imprisonments and wicked murders? None of all these; the people of this land were not starving or dying under the iron heel of an Alva or a Robespierre, but their civil liberties had been denied, their political freedom refused, and rather than endure the loss of these precious things, they were willing to encounter danger and to brave death. The men and women who suffered at Concord and at Lexington 100 years ago to-day, were martyrs to the sacred cause of personal liberty! Looking over the records of the past we find, again and again repeated, the burden of their complaints. Not that they were starving or dying, but that they were taxed without their consent, and that they were denied personal representation.

The congress which assembled at Philadelphia in 1774, declared that "the foundation of liberty and of all free governments is the right of the people to participate in their legislative council"; and the House of Burgesses, assembled in Virginia in the same year, asserted "That a determined system is formed and pressed for reducing us to slavery, by subjecting us to the payment of taxes imposed without our consent." Strong language this, as strong as any we women have ever employed in addressing the men of this nation. Our ancestors called the imposition of taxes without their consent, slavery, and the denial of personal representation, tyranny. Slavery and tyranny! words which they tell us to-day are too strong for our use. We must find some mild and lady-like phrases in which to describe these oppressions. We must employ some safe and gentle terms to indicate the crimes which our forefathers denounced! My friends, what was truth a century ago is truth to-day! Other things may have changed, but justice has not changed in a hundred years!

In 1876 a presidential election was again approaching, and to meet the exigencies of the campaign a woman suffrage committee was formed to ask the legislature to grant presidential suffrage to women, as it was strictly within their power to do without a constitutional amendment. To this end Mrs. Gage prepared an appeal which was widely circulated throughout the State:

Within a year the election of President and Vice-President of the United States, will again take place. The right to vote for these functionaries is a National and not a State right; the United States has unquestioned control of this branch of suffrage, and in its constitution has declared to whom it has delegated this power. Article 2 of the Constitution of the United States, is devoted to the president; the manner of choosing him, his power, his duties, etc. In regard to the method of

Digitized by Google

choosing the president, Par. 2, Sec. 1, Art. 2, reads thus: "Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of senators and representatives to which the State may be entitled in the congress." There is no other authority for the appointment of presidential electors, either in the Constitution of the United States, or in the constitution of any State. The constitution of the State of New York is entirely silent upon the appointment of presidential electors, for the reason that the constitution of the United States declares that they *shall* be appointed in such manner as the legislature may direct. With the exception of South Carolina, every State in the Union has adopted the plan of choosing presidential electors by ballot, and it is in the power of the legislature of each State to prescribe the qualifications of those who shall be permitted to vote for such electors.

The authority to prescribe the qualifications of those persons in the State of New York who shall be permitted to vote for electors of President and Vice-President of the United States, therefore lies alone in the legislature of this State. That body has power in this respect superior to the State constitution; it rises above the constitution; it is invested with its powers by the Constitution of the United States; it is under national authority, and need in no way be governed by any representative clause which may exist in the State constitution. In prescribing the qualifications of those persons who shall vote for electors, the legislature has power to exclude all persons who cannot read and write. It has power to say that no person unless possessing a freehold estate of the value of two hundred and fifty dollars, shall vote for such electors. It has power to declare that only tax-payers shall vote for such electors, it is even vested with authority to say that no one but church members shall be entitled to vote for electors of President and Vice-President of the United States. The legislature of this State at its next session has even power to cut off the right of all white men to vote for electors at the presidential election next fall. It matters not what qualifications the State itself may have prescribed for electors of State officers, the question who shall vote for president and vice-president is on an entirely different basis, and prescribing the qualifications for such electors lies in entirely different hands. It is a question of national import, with which the State (in its constitution) has nothing to do, and over which even congress has no power. The legislature which is to assemble in Albany, the first Tuesday in January next, will have power, by the passage of a simple bill, to secure to the women of this State the right to vote for electors at the presidential election in the fall of 1876, and thus to inaugurate the centennial year by an act of equity and justice that will be in accordance with that part of the Declaration of Independence which declares that "governments derive their *just* powers from the consent of the governed." Shall it not be done?

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE,
LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE,
CLEMENCE S. LOZIER, M. D.,
N. Y. State Woman Suffrage Com.

Digitized by Google

Lillie Devereux Blake

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

A memorial embodying this claim was presented to the legislature, and on, January 18, the committee went to Albany and were heard by the Judiciary Committee of the Assembly, to whom their paper had been referred. Hon. Robert H. Strahan of New York presided. On February 8, the memorialists * had another meeting before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, in the Senate chamber, Hon. Bradford L. Prince presiding. The audience was overflowing, and the corridors so crowded that the meeting adjourned to the Assembly chamber by order of the chairman. Soon after, Hon. George H. West of Saratoga presented a bill giving the women of the State the right to vote for president. It was referred to the Judiciary Committee and reported adversely, notwithstanding it was twice called up and debated by its friends, Messrs. Strahan, Husted, Ogden, Hogeboom and West. No vote was reached on the measure, but this much of consideration was a gain over previous years, when nothing had been done beyond the presentation of a bill and its reference to a committee.

In 1876 Governor Samuel J. Tilden appointed Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell as commissioner of the State Board of Charities, the first official position a woman ever held in this State.

During the winter of 1877 a memorial was sent to the legislature, asking that women be allowed to serve as school officers. The Hon. William N. Emerson, senator from Monroe, presented the following bill:

AN ACT *to Authorize the Election of Women to School Offices.*

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Any woman of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, and possessing the qualifications prescribed for men, shall be eligible to any office under the general or special school laws of this State, subject to the same conditions and requirements as prescribed to men.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

Petitions and memorials from all parts of the State were poured into the legislature, praying for the passage of the bill. Mr. Emerson made an eloquent speech in its favor, and labored earnestly for the measure. It passed the Senate by a vote of 19 to 9; the Assembly by a vote of 84 to 19. This success was hailed with great rejoicing by the women of the State who understood the progress of events. But their delight was turned into indignation and disappointment when the governor, Lucius Robinson, returned the bill to the Senate with the following veto:

* Helen M. Slocum, Dr. Clemence Lozier, Mrs. Devereux Blake.

Digitized by Google

STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
ALBANY, May 8, 1877.

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 61, entitled "An act to authorize the election of women to school offices."

This bill goes too far or not far enough. It provides that women may hold any or all of the offices connected with the department of education, that is to say, a woman may be elected superintendent of public instruction, women may be appointed school commissioners, members of boards of education and trustees of school districts. In some of these positions it will become their duty to make contracts, purchase materials, build and repair school-houses, and to supervise and effect all the transactions of school business, involving an annual expenditure of over twelve million dollars in this State. There can be no greater reason that women should occupy these positions than the less responsible ones of supervisors, town clerks, justices of the peace, commissioners of highways, overseers of the poor, and numerous others. If women are physically and mentally fitted for one class of these stations, they are equally so for the others.

But at this period in the history of the world such enactments as the present hardly comport with the wisdom and dignity of legislation. The God of nature has appointed different fields of labor, duty and usefulness for the sexes. His decrees cannot be changed by human legislation. In the education of our children the mother stands far above all superintendents, commissioners, trustees and school teachers. Her influence in the family, in social intercourse and enterprises, outweighs all the mere machinery of benevolence and education. To lower her from the high and holy place given her by nature, is to degrade her power and to injure rather than benefit the cause of education itself. In all enlightened and Christian nations the experience and observations of ages have illustrated and defined the relative duties of the sexes in promoting the best interests of society. Few, if any, of the intelligent and right-minded among women desire or would be willing to accept the change which such a law would inaugurate.

The bill is moreover a clear infraction of the spirit if not the letter of the constitution. Under that instrument women have no right to vote, and it cannot be supposed that it is the intention of the constitution that persons not entitled to the right of suffrage should be eligible to some of the most important offices in the State. L. ROBINSON.

On May 24, 25, 1877, the National and State conventions were again held in New York, at Steinway Hall. Both conventions passed resolutions denouncing Governor Robinson's action in his veto. The following address was issued by the State association:

To the Voters and Legislators of New York:

The women of the State of New York, in convention assembled, do most earnestly protest against the injustice with which they are treated by the State, where in point of numbers they are in excess of the men:

First—They are denied the right of choosing their own rulers, but are compelled to submit to the choice of a minority consisting of its male residents, fully one-third of

Digitized by Google

whom are of foreign birth. *Second*—They are held amenable to laws they have had no share in making and in which they are forbidden a voice—laws which touch all their most vital interests of education, industry, children, property, life and liberty. *Third*—While compelled to bear the burdens and suffer the penalties of government, they are debarred the honors and emoluments of civil service, and the control of offices in the righteous discharge of whose duties their interest is equal to that of men. *Fourth*—They are taxed without their consent to sustain men in office who enact laws directly opposing their interests, and inasmuch as the State of New York pays one-sixth the taxes of the United States, its women feel the arm of oppression—like Briareus with his hundred hands—touching and crushing them with its burdens. *Fifth*—They are under the power of an autocrat whose salary they must pay, but who, in opposition to the will of the people—as recently shown in the passage of the School bill by the legislature—has by his veto denied them all official authority in the control of the public schools, and this despite the fact of there being 3,670 more girls of school age than boys, and 14,819 more women than men teaching in the State. *Sixth*—Under pretence of regulating public morals, women of the *femme de pave* class, many of whom have been driven to this mode of life as a livelihood, are subjected to more oppressive laws than their partners in vice. *Seventh*—The laws treat married women as criminals by taking from them all legal control of their children, while those born outside of marriage belong absolutely to the mothers. *Eighth*—They forbid the mother's inheritance of property from her children in case the father is living, thus making her of no consideration in the eyes of those to whom she has given birth. *Ninth*—They give the husband control of the common property—allow him to spend the whole personal estate in riotous living, or even to sell the home over his wife's head, subject only to her third life-interest in case she survives him. *Tenth*—They allow the husband to imprison her at his pleasure within his own house, the court sustaining him in this coërcion until the wife "submits herself to her husband's will." *Eleventh*—They allow the husband while the common property is in his possession, "without even the formality of a legal complaint, the taking of an oath or the filing of a bond for the good faith of his action," to advertise his wife through the public press as a deserter and to forbid her credit. *Twelfth*—They deny the widow the right of inheritance in the common property that they give the widower, allow her but forty days' residence in the family mansion before paying rent to her husband's heirs, thus treating her as if she were an alien to her own children—set off to her a few paltry articles of household use, close the estate through a process of law, and make the days of her bereavement doubly days of sorrow.

The above laws of marriage, placing irresponsible authority in the hands of the husband, have given him a power of moral coërcion over the wife, making her virtually his slave. Without entering into fuller details of the injustice and oppression of the laws upon all women, married and single, we will sum the whole subject up in the language of the French Woman's Rights League, which characterizes woman's position thus:

(1) Woman is held *politically* to have no existence; (2) *civilly*, she is a minor; (3) in marriage she is a serf; (4) in labor she is made inferior and robbed of her earnings; (5) in public instruction she is sacrificed to man; (6) out of marriage, answers to the faults committed by both; (7) as a mother is deprived of her right to her children; (8) she is only deemed equally responsible, intelligent and answerable in taxes and crimes.

By order of the New York State Woman Suffrage Society.
May, 1877. MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE, *Secretary*.

In the summer of 1877 another effort was made by women of wealth to be relieved from taxation. Several memorials to that effect were sent to the legislature, one headed by Susan A.

Digitized by Google

King* of New York, a self-made woman who had accumulated a large fortune and owned much real estate. Her memorial, signed by a few others, represented $9,000,000. The committee bearing these waited on many members of the legislature to secure their influence when such a bill should be presented, which was done March 11, by Col. Alfred Wagstaff, with warm recommendations. He was followed by Senator McCarthy of Onondaga, who also introduced a bill for an amendment to the constitution to secure to women the right of suffrage. Both these bills called out the determined opposition of Thomas C. Ecclesine, senator from the eleventh district, and the ridicule of others. The delegation of ladies, sitting there as representatives of half the people of the State, felt insulted to have their demands thus sneered at; it was for them a moment of bitter humiliation. In the evening, however, their time for retaliation came, as they had a hearing in the Senate chamber, before the Judiciary Committee, where an immense crowd assembled at an early hour. The chairman of the committee Hon. William H. Robertson, presided. Each of the ladies, in the course of her speech, referred to the insulting remarks of Mr. Hughes of Washington county. That gentleman, being present, looked as if he regretted his unfortunate jokes, and winced under the sarcasm of the ladies.

Soon after this, great excitement was created by the close of Stewart's Home for Working Women. This fine building, on the corner of Thirty-second street and Fourth avenue, had been erected by the merchant prince for the use of working women, who could there find a home at a moderate expense. The millionaire dead, his large fortune passed into other hands. The

* Miss King, the head of a New York tea-dealing firm composed of women, who control a capital of $1,000,000, has recently gone to China to make purchases. Her previous business experience, as narrated by a correspondent of the Chicago *Tribune*, explains her fitness for her mission, while it incidentally throws some light on the secrets of the tea-company business:

"Previous to the outbreak of our civil war Miss King was extensively engaged in utilizing the leaves of the great blackberry and raspberry crops running to waste in the rich lowlands of Georgia and Alabama, and kept in that fertile region a large levy of Northern women—smart, like herself—to superintend the gathering of the leaves and their preparation for shipment to headquarters in New York. These leaves were prepared for the market at their manipulating halls in one of the narrow streets on the Hudson side of New York city. Over this stage of the tea preparations Miss King had special supervision, and, by a generous use of the genuine imported teas, worked up our American productions into all the accredited varieties of the black and green teas of commerce. Here the female supervision apparently ended. In their extensive tea ware-rooms in Walker street the business was conducted by the shrewdest representatives of Gothamite trade, with all the appliances of the great Chinese tea-importing houses. Here were huge piles of tea-chests, assorted and unassorted, and the high-salaried tea-taster with his row of tiny cups of hot-drawn tea, delicately sampling and classifying the varieties and grades for market. The breaking out of the war stopped the Southern supplies and sent Miss King's female agents to their Northern homes. But the business was made to conform to the new order of things. Large cargoes of imported black teas were bought as they arrived and were skillfully manipulated into those high-cost varieties of green teas so extensively purchased by the government for its commissary and medical departments."

Digitized by Google

building was completed and furnished in a style of elegance far beyond what was appropriated to that purpose. On April 2, with a great flourish, the immense building was thrown open for public inspection. A large number of women applied at once for admission, but encountered a set of rules that drove most of them away. This gave Judge Hilton an excuse for violating his obligation to carry out the plan of his dead benefactor, and in a few weeks he closed the house to working women and opened it as the Park Hotel, for which it was so admirably furnished and fitted that it was the general opinion that it was intended for this from the beginning. Great indignation was felt in the community, the women calling a meeting to express their dissapointment and dissatisfaction. This was held in Cooper Institute, under the auspices of the Woman Suffrage Association.* Had Mr. Stewart provided a permanent home for working women it would have been but a meager return for the underpaid toil of the thousands who had labored for half a century to build up his princely fortune. But even the idea of such an act of justice died with him.

In 1879 that eminent philanthropist Dr. Hervey Backus Wilbur, superintendent of the State Idiot Asylum at Syracuse, urged the passage of a law requiring the employment of competent women as physicians in the female wards of the State insane asylums. Petitions prepared by him were circulated by the officers of the Women's Medical College, of the New York Infirmary, by Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell of the State Board of Charities, and by Drs. Willard Parker, Mary Putnam Jacobi, and other eminent physicians of New York. The bill prepared by Dr. Wilbur was introduced in the Assembly by Hon. Erastus Brooks, and required the trustees of each of the four State asylums for the insane, "to employ one or more competent, well-educated female physicians to have the charge of the female patients of said asylum, under the direction of the medical superintendents of the several asylums, as in the case of the other or male assistant physicians, and to take the place of such male assistant physician or physicians in the wards of the female patients." Although Dr. Wilbur stood at the head of his profession, his authority upon everything connected with the feeble-minded being not only recognized in this country but in Europe also as absolute, yet this bill, which

* Mrs. Lozier presided. Addresses were made by Matilda Fletcher of Iowa, Mrs. Helen Slocum and Mrs. Devereux Blake.

Digitized by Google

did not contemplate placing a woman in charge of such an institution, and which was so purely moral in its character, met with ridicule and opposition from the press of the State, to which Dr. Wilbur made an exhaustive reply, showing the need of women as physicians in all institutions in which unfortunate women are incarcerated.

When the fall elections of 1879 approached, a circular letter was sent to every candidate for office in the city, asking his views on the question of woman suffrage, and delegations waited on the nominees for mayor. Mr. Edward Cooper, the Republican candidate, declared he had no sympathy with the movement, while Hon. Augustus Schell, the Democratic candidate, received the ladies with great courtesy, and avowed himself friendly at least to the demand for equal wages and better opportunities for education, and in the trades and professions. From the answers received, a list of candidates was prepared. On the evening of October 30, a crowded mass-meeting was held in Steinway Hall to advocate the election of those men who were favorable to the enfranchisement of woman. Mr. Schell was chosen Mayor. The re-nomination in 1879, of Lucius Robinson for governor by the Democratic convention, aroused the opposition of the women who understood the politics of the State. He had declared that "the God of Nature did not intend women for public life"; they resolved that the same power should retire Mr. Robinson from public life, and held mass-meetings to that end.* These meetings were all alike crowded and enthusiastic, and the speakers † felt richly paid for their efforts. A thorough canvass of the State was also made, and a protest ‡ extensively circulated, condemning the governor for his veto of the school-bill.

---

* In Poughkeepsie, Yonkers, Harlem, Williamsburgh, Brighton, and in several districts in the city of New York.

† Matilda Joslyn Gage, Helen M. Loder, Mrs. Clara Neyman, Mrs. Slocum, Mrs. Miller and Mrs. Blake.

‡ *To the Women of the State of New York:*

The undersigned, citizens of the State of New York, who if free to do so, would express themselves at the ballot box, but who by unjust enactments are debarred the exercise of that political freedom whereto "the God of nature" entitles them, earnestly protest against the proposed reelection of Lucius Robinson as governor. They say naught against his honor as a man, but they protest because when the legislature of the Empire State had passed a bill making women eligible to school-boards. Lucius Robinson, by his veto, kept this bill from becoming law. They therefore call on all men and women who respect themselves and dare maintain their rights, to do all in their power to defeat the reelection of one who has set himself against the advance made by Iowa, Kansas, Oregon, Illinois, Michigan, Colorado, California, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, in many of which States woman's right to vote on school questions is also recognized.

[Signed:] Matilda Joslyn Gage, *President N. Y. State Woman Suffrage Association.* Jennie M. Lozier, M. D., *Secretary.* Lillie Devereux Blake, *Vice-President National Association.* Clemence S. Lozier, M. D., *President N. Y. City Association.* Susan A. King, Cordelia S. Knapp, Helen M. Slocum, Susan B. Anthony, Amanda Deyo, Helen M. Cooke, Elizabeth B. Phelps, Charlotte Fowler Wells, Emma S. Allen.

Digitized by Google

Mr. F. B. Thurber, and Miss Susan A. King contributed liberally to this campaign. Handbills containing the protest and a call for a series of mass-meetings, were distributed by the thousands all over the State. The last meeting was held at the seventh ward Republican wigwam, an immense structure, in Brooklyn; its use was given by the unanimous vote of the club.* At every one of these meetings resolutions were passed condemning Mr. Robinson, and electors were urged to cast their votes against him. No doubt the enthusiasm the women aroused for his opponent helped in a measure to defeat him.

In the meantime, women in the eleventh senatorial district were concentrating their efforts for the defeat of Thomas H. Eccelsine. His Republican opponent, Hon. Chas. E. Foster, was a pronounced advocate of woman suffrage. Miss King,† who resided in this district, exerted all her influence for his election, giving time, money and thought to the canvass. On the morning of November 5, the day after election, the papers announced that Mr. Cornell was chosen governor, and that Mr. Ecclesine, who two years before had been elected by 7,000 majority, was defeated by 600, and Mr. Foster chosen senator in his stead.

This campaign attracted much attention. The journals throughout the country commented upon the action of the women. It was conceded that their efforts had counted for something in influencing the election, and from this moment the leaders of the woman suffrage movement in New York regarded themselves as possessing some political influence.

In January, 1880, Governor Alonzo B. Cornell, in his first message to the legislature, among other recommendations, embodied the following:

> The policy of making women eligible as school officers has been adopted in several States with beneficial results, and the question is exciting much discussion in this State. Women are equally competent with men for this duty, and it cannot be doubted that their admission to representation would largely increase the efficacy of our school management. The favorable attention of the legislature is earnestly directed to this subject.

With such words from the chief executive it was an easy matter to find friends for a measure making women eligible as school

* Chester A. Arthur, chairman of the Republican campaign committee, presented the motion.

† She threw her spacious apartments open, and gave some of the voters a free lunch, that she might have the opportunity of adding her personal persuasions to the public protests. Miss King and Miss Helen Potter, the distinguished reader, then residing with Miss King, assisted in raising a banner for Cornell and Foster, applauded by the multitude of by-standers.

Digitized by Google

officers. Early in the session the following bill was introduced by Hon. Lorraine B. Sessions of Cattaraugus:

No person shall be deemed ineligible to serve as any school officer, or to vote at any school meeting, by reason of sex, who has the voter's qualifications required by law.

Senator Edwin G. Halbert of Broome rendered efficient aid and the bill passed at once in the Senate by a nearly unanimous vote. Hon. G. W. Husted of Westchester introduced it at once in the assembly and earnestly championed the measure. It passed by a vote of 87 to 3. The bill was laid before the governor, who promptly affixed his signature to it, and thus, at last, secured to the women of the Empire State the right to vote on all school matters, and to hold any school offices to which they might be chosen. The bill was signed on February 12, and the next day being Friday, was the last day of registration in the city of Syracuse, the election there taking place on the following Tuesday. The news did not reach there until late in the day, the evening papers being the first to contain it. But, although so little was known of the measure, thirteen women registered their names as voters, and cast their ballots at the election. This was the first time the women of New York ever voted, and Tuesday, February 18, 1880, is a day to be remembered.* The voting for officers, like all other school matters, was provided for, not under the general laws, but by the school statutes. There are two general elections in chartered cities and universal suffrage for school as well as all other officers; no preparation being required of voters but registration. In the rural districts school meetings

* Mrs. Lucy A. Brand, principal of the Genesee school of this city, a woman with abilities as good as those of any male principal, but who, because she is a woman, receives $550 less salary a year than a male principal, was the first woman in the State of New York to cast a vote under the new school law. On Saturday afternoon she was at a friend's house, when the *Journal* was thrown in, containing the first editorial notice of the passage of the law. Mrs. Brand saw the welcome announcement. "Let us go and register," she at once said, her heart swelling with joy and thankfulness that even this small quantity of justice had been done woman. "Where is my shawl? I feel as if I should die if I don't get there," for the hour was late, and the time for closing the registry lists was near at hand. To have lost this opportunity would have placed her in the position of a second Tantalus, the cup withdrawn just as it touched her lips. But she was in time, and the important act of registering accomplished, she had but to possess her soul in patience until the following Tuesday. Who shall say how long the two intervening days were to her; but Tuesday morning at last arrived, when, for the first time, Mrs. Brand was to exercise the freeman's right of self-government. A gentleman, the owner of the block in which she resided, offered to accompany her to the polls, although he was a Democrat and knew Mrs. Brand would vote the Republican ticket. Although not hesitating to go alone, Mrs. Brand accepted this courtesy. As she entered the polling place the men present fell back in a semi-circle. Not a sound was heard, not a whisper, not a breath. In silence and with a joyous solemnity well befitting the occasion, Mrs. Brand cast her first vote, at five minutes past eight in the morning. The post-master of the city, Mr. Chase, offered his congratulations. A few ordinary remarks were exchanged, and then Mrs. Brand left the place. And that was all; neither more nor less. No opposition, no rudeness, no jostling crowd of men, but such behavior as is seen when Christians come together at the sacrament. I have long known Mrs. Brand as a noble woman, but talking with her a few days since I could but notice the added sense of self-respecting dignity that freedom gives. "I feel a constant gratitude that even some portion of my rights have been recognized," said she, and I left her, more than ever impressed, if that is possible, with the beauty and sacredness of freedom.—[M. J. G.

Digitized by Google

are held for elections, and there are, by the statutes, three classes of voters described by law.

1. Every person (male or female) who is a resident of the district, of the age of twenty-one years, entitled to hold lands in this State, who either owns or hires real estate in the district liable to taxation for school purposes.

2. Every citizen of the United States (male or female) above the age of twenty-one years, who is a resident of the district, and who owns any personal property assessed on the last preceding assessment roll of the town exceeding $50 in value, exclusive of such as is exempt from execution.

3. Every citizen of the United States (male or female) above the age of twenty-one years, who is a resident of the district and who has permanently residing with him, or her, a child or children of school age, some one or more of whom shall have attended the school of the district for a period of at least eight weeks within the year preceding the time at which the vote is offered.

Several of the large cities hold their elections on the first Tuesday in March, while the majority of the rural districts hold their school meetings on the second Tuesday in October. Preparations were at once made to call out a large vote of women in the cities holding spring elections, but all such efforts were checked by official action. The mayor of Rochester wrote to the governor, asking him if the new law applied to cities. Mr. Cornell laid the question before Attorney-General Ward, who promptly gave an opinion that inasmuch as the words "school meeting" were used in the law, women could only vote where such meetings were held, but were not entitled to vote at the elections in large cities. Meantime the New York City Association called a meeting of congratulation on the passage of the bill on February 25, when Robinson Hall was crowded to overflowing with the friends of woman suffrage, some of whom addressed the vast audience.*

A mass-meeting of women was held at Albany, in Geological Hall, Mrs. Blake presiding. It was especially announced that the meeting was only for ladies, but several men who strayed in were permitted to remain, to take that part in the proceedings usually allowed to women in masculine assemblies, that is, to be silent spectators. Resolutions were passed, urging the women to vote at the coming election, and the names of several ladies were suggested as trustees. March 19, 1880, the Albany County Woman Suffrage Association † was formed, whose first active duty was to rouse the women to vote in the coming school election, which they did, in spite of the attorney-general's opinion.

* Rev. Robert Collyer, Elizabeth L. Saxon, Clara Neyman, Augusta Cooper Bristol, Helen M. Slocum, Hamilton Wilcox, Mrs. Devereux Blake, and Dr. Clemence Lozier who presided.

† Mary Seymour Howell, *President;* Miss Kate Stoneman, *Secretary.* Miss Stoneman cast the first vote at the school election in Albany.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Edwin G. Halbert of Broome also introduced a bill in the Senate, for a constitutional amendment, to secure to women the right of suffrage, which was passed by that conservative body just before its adjournment. Meantime Mr. Wilcox urged the passage of the bill to prohibit disfranchisement, which was brought to a third reading in the Assembly. He prepared and circulated among the members of the legislature a brief,* showing their power to extend the suffrage. The argument is unanswerable, establishing the fact that women had voted through the early days of the Colonies, and proving, by unanswerable authorities, their right to do so; thus establishing the right of women to vote in 1885. Mr. Wilcox' researches on this point will prove invaluable in the enfranchisement of woman, as his facts are irresistible. Following is the proposed bill:

AN ACT *to Prohibit Disfranchisement.*

Introduced in the Assembly by Hon. Alex. F. Andrews, March 31, 1880. Reported by the Judiciary Committee for consideration, May 24. Ordered to third reading, May 27. Again so reported, unanimously, March 16, 1881. Again ordered to third reading, May 3, 1881; ayes 60, noes 40. Vote on passage, May 11, 1881; ayes 59, noes 55, majority 4. (65 necessary to pass).

Whereas, the common law entitles women to vote under the same qualifications as men; and

Whereas, said common law has never been abrogated in this State; and

Whereas, a practice nevertheless obtains of treating as disfranchised all persons to whom suffrage is not secured by express words of the constitution; and

Whereas, the constitution makes no provision for this practice, but on the contrary declares that its own object is to secure the blessings of freedom to the people, and provides that no member of this State shall be disfranchised or deprived of any of the privileges secured to any citizen unless by constitutional provision and judicial decision thereunder; and

Whereas, this practice, despite the want of authority therefor, has by continuance acquired the force of law; and

Whereas, many citizens object to this practice as a violation of the spirit and purpose of the constitution, as well as against justice and public policy; and

Whereas, the legislature has corrected this practice in repeated instances, its power to do so being in such instances fully recognized and exercised; therefore

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Every woman shall be free to vote, under the qualifications required of men, or to refrain from voting, as she may choose; and no person shall be debarred, by reason of sex, from voting at any election, or at any town meeting; school meeting, or other choice of government functionaries whatsoever.

SEC. 2. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect immediately.

Various memorials were sent to the legislature in behalf of this bill, and a hearing was granted to its advocates.† The Assembly

* See appendix.

† Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Slocum, Mrs Saxon, of Louisiana.

Digitized by Google

chamber in the beautiful new capitol was crowded as it had never been before. A large proportion of the senators and assemblymen were present, many of the judges from the various courts, while the governor and lieutenant-governor occupied prominent places, and large crowds of fashionable ladies and leading gentlemen filled the seats and galleries. The chairman of the committee, Hon. George L. Ferry, presided. The ladies were graciously received by the governor, who, at their request, gave them the pen with which he signed the bill providing "school suffrage for women," and in return they presented him a handsome gold-mounted pen, a gift from the City Society.

The first voting by women after the passage of the new law, was at Syracuse, February 17, only five days after the bill received the governor's signature, but the great body of women had not the opportunity until October. At that time in Fayetteville, the home of Matilda Joslyn Gage, women voted in large numbers; the three who had been placed upon the ticket, trustee, clerk and librarian were all elected. It was an hour of triumph for Mrs. Gage who was heartily congratulated upon the result. It was remarked that so quiet an election had seldom been known. At Middletown, Orange county, Dr. Lydia Sayre Hasbrook urged the women to take advantage of their new privilege, and when the day of election came, although it was cold and stormy, over 200 voted, and elected the entire ticket of women for trustees, Mrs. Hasbrook herself being chosen as one.

There were many places, however, where no women voted, for the reform had all the antagonisms and prejudices of custom to overcome. Many obstacles were thrown in the way to prevent them from exercising this right. The men of their families objecting, and misconstruing the law, kept them in doubt both as to their rights and duties. The clergy from their pulpits warned the women of their congregations not to vote, fathers forbade their daughters, husbands their wives. The wonder is that against such a pressure so many women did vote after all.

October 12, 1880, the elections took place in a large proportion of the eleven thousand school districts of the State, and the daily journals were full of items as to the result. We copy a few of these:

LOWVILLE, Lewis County, Oct. 16, 1880.—The business meeting was held on the evening of the 12th, and was attended by twenty ladies. On the following day at 1 P. M., the election was held. The ladies had an independent ticket opposing the incumbent clerk and trustee. Seven voted. Four were challenged. They swore their

votes in. Boys just turned twenty-one years of age voted unchallenged. The clerk, who is a young sprig of a lawyer, made himself conspicuous by challenging our votes. He first read the opinion of the State superintendent of public instruction, and said that the penalty for illegal voting was not less than six months' imprisonment. My vote was challenged, and although my husband is an owner of much real estate and cannot sell one foot of it without my consent, I could not vote.

From Penn Yan a woman writes:—About seventy ladies voted here, but none who did not either own or lease real estate. The argument so often used against woman suffrage—viz: that the first to avail themselves of the privilege would be those least qualified to do so, is directly refuted, in this town at least, since the ladies who voted are without doubt those who by natural ability and by culture are abundantly competent to vote intelligently as well as conscientiously.

A woman in Nunda writes:—Only six women attended the school meeting in the first district on the 12th, but over forty went to the polls on the 13th. Two women were on one of the tickets; the opposition ticket was made up entirely of males. We were supported by the best men in the village. The ticket bearing the names of Mrs. Fidelia J. M. Whitcomb, M. D., and Mrs. S. Augusta Herrick, was elected.

From Poland a woman writes:—Our school meeting was attended by about thirty men and two women. The population of the village is between three and four hundred. My neighbor and I were proud of the privilege of casting our first vote. There was nothing of special interest to call out voters, as our trustees are satisfactory to all. If circumstances required, there would be many women voters here.

David Hopkins and Gustave Dettloff were candidates for school trustee in district No. 1 of New Lots, Long Island, at the last election. Mr. Hopkins is a farmer and was seeking reëlection. Mr. Dettloff is connected with an insurance company in this city, and is a well-known resident of the town. The friends of Mr. Hopkins about an hour before the closing of the polls, perceived that there was danger of their candidate's defeat. A consultation was held, and it was decided to utilize the new law giving women the privilege of voting. Accordingly, several farm wagons were procured and sent through the district to gather in the farmers' wives and daughters. The wagons returned to the polls with 107 women, all of whom voted for Mr. Hopkins, thus saving him from defeat. It was too late to use a counter poison. The total number of votes cast was 329, Mr. Hopkins receiving eighty majority.

PORT JERVIS, Oct. 13.—The annual election of school trustees occurred to-day and was attended with unusual excitement. Eight hundred and thirty votes were polled, 150, for the women's ticket, the remainder being divided. Only fifty ladies voted, a great many being kept from the polls by the crowd of loafers standing around. The Protestant ticket, composed of three men, was elected. The election was held in a small room, and this was crowded with men who amused themselves by passing remarks about the ladies until the police were called in. Every lady who offered her vote was challenged and a great many left the polls in disgust. In Carpenter's Point and Sparrowbush, two suburbs of the village, the ladies voted and were not molested.

Only a few women voted on Tuesday evening at the election for school trustees in the first district of Southfield, Staten Island. When the poll was opened Judge John G. Vaughan, the retiring trustee, presided. A motion was made to reëlect him by acclamation. Amid great confusion Judge Vaughan put the motion and declared it carried. Then Officers Fitzgerald and Leary had to take charge of the meeting to preserve order, and Judge Vaughan's opponents withdrew, threatening proceedings to have the election declared invalid. Abram C. Wood was elected school trustee in the West New Brighton (S. I.) district by 69 majority, which included the votes of eight of eleven women present. Other women promised to vote if Mr. Wood needed their support. Mr. Robert B. Minturn presided.

SING SING, Oct. 13.—Five women voted at the school meeting last night.

Digitized by Google

MOUNT MORRIS, Oct. 13.—One hundred and twenty women voted at the school election here last evening.

GLEN'S FALLS, Oct. 13.—I am informed that women did vote here and in the neighborhood last evening.

PERRY, Oct. 13.—A large woman vote was cast here. Two women were elected members of the school-board.

PEEKSKILL, Oct. 13.—Five women voted in one district.

SHELTER ISLAND, Oct. 13.—Women voted at our school meeting.

COFFIN SUMMIT, Oct. 15.—Six women voted at the school meeting here. A lady was nominated for trustee and received many votes, but was defeated.

STAMFORD, Oct. 15.—Four ladies voted at the school meeting.

PORT RICHMOND, Oct. 15.—Six ladies attended the school meeting. The chairman, Mr. Sidney P. Ronason, made a speech, welcoming them, stating that an unsuccessful effort had been made by citizens to induce a leading lady to become a candidate for trustee; also, that Lester A. Scofield, the retiring trustee, would cheerfully give way if any competent lady would take his place. This Mr. Scofield confirmed, but, no lady being nominated, he was reëlected without opposition.

BALDWINVILLE, Oct. 15.—Thirty-three ladies voted at the school election.

LOCKPORT, Oct. 15.—Two Quaker ladies voted at the school meeting of the first district of this township. One of them, Dr. Sarah Lanb Cushing, was chosen tax-collector by 23 votes out of 26. On the entrance of the ladies, smoking and all disorder ceased, and the meeting was uncommonly well-conducted.

LAWTON STATION, Oct. 15.—Of the 16 votes cast at the school meeting here, 15 were given by women. A woman received the highest vote for school trustee, but withdrew in favor of one of the male candidates. The proceedings were enlivened with singing by the pupils under the direction of the teacher. Several improvements in the building were ordered at the instance of the ladies.

KNOWLESVILLE, Oct. 15.—Many women meant to vote at the school meeting, but a person went from house to house and threatened them with legal penalties if they did. Mrs. James Kernholtz was nominated for tax-collector at the meeting, but declined, saying the pay was too small. Miss Adelina Lockwood, being nominated for librarian, declined, but was elected by acclamation, amid great applause. The meeting was very large, but unusually orderly.

FLUSHING, Oct. 15.—Forty women voted at the school meeting here, and in the adjoining district.

SYRACUSE, Oct. 14, 1881.—At the Fayetteville, Onondaga county, school-district election yesterday, a direct issue was made on the question of woman's rights. The candidate of the women was chosen. This is the women's second victory in that place, giving them control of the school-board.

A correspondent describing what the voters had to enconnter, said:

Is the question asked, why have not more women voted? I answer, hundreds of women in this State were debarred by falsehood and intimidation. No sooner had the school suffrage law passed than the wildest statements about it were made. It was given out that the Governor had recalled the bill from the Secretary of State after signing it (which he could not do), and vetoed it; that the law was unconstitutional; that it was defective and inoperative; that it did not apply to cities and villages; that it had been repealed; and like untruths. Pains was taken to hide its existence by corrupt officials, who told the women that the law did not apply to the places where they lived, or who withheld the fact of its passage. The State was flooded just before the elections with

Digitized by Google

an incorrect statement that only the rich women could vote; that the children's mothers could not unless they held real estate. The story was also set afloat that the attorney-general had indorsed this statement; which that gentleman promply repudiated. All this we corrected as fast and as far as we could; but it unavoidably did much harm.

Wholesale hindrance and terrorism too, were used. A few samples are these: In Albany, many women were threatened by their own husbands with expulsion from house and home, imprisonment, bodily violence or death if they dared vote; while many others were deterred by insults and threats of social persecution. Many persons ridiculed and abused those who sought to vote. In some districts the inspectors refused to register qualified women, while in others votes were refused. Statements were widely published that the law did not apply to Albany. In Knowersville, the village teacher went to every house, and threatened the women with state-prison if they dared to vote. In Mount Morris, the president of the Board of Education denounced the ladies who induced others to vote. In Fayetteville, Saratoga and elsewhere, the ladies' request for some share in making the tickets was scornfully ignored. In Port Jervis, the Board of Education declined a hall that was offered, and had the election in a low, dirty little room. Smoke was puffed in the ladies' faces, challenges were frequent, and all sorts of impudent questions were asked of the voters. In Long Island City many ladies were challenged, and stones were thrown in the street at Mrs. Emma Gates Conkling, the lady who was most active in bringing out the new voters. In New Brighton, the village paper threatened the women with jail if they voted; and when a motion was made in one district that the ladies be invited to attend, a large negative vote was given, one man shouting, "We have enough of women at home; we don't want 'em here!" At West New Brighton it was openly announced that the meeting should be too turbulent for ladies, insomuch that many who intended to go staid away, and the few who went were obliged to wait till all the men had voted. In Newham a gang of low fellows took possession of the polling place early, filled it with smoke of the worst tobacco, and covered the floor with tobacco juice; and through all this the few ladies who ventured to vote had to pass. In New York a man who claims to be a gentleman said: "If my wife undertook to vote I would trample her under my feet." In New Rochelle the school trustee told the women they were not entitled to vote, and tried to prevent a meeting being held to inform them. Clergymen from the pulpit urged women not to vote, and a mob gathered at the polls and blocked the way. These are but samples of the difficulties under which the new law went into operation; and it is the truth that there was as much bulldozing of voters in New York as ever in the South, though sometimes by other means.

In 1880 Mrs. Blake was sent by the New York society to the Republican and Democratic presidential conventions at Chicago and Cincinnati, and on her return a meeting was called in Republican Hall, July 9, to hear her report as to the comparative treat-

Digitized by Google

ment received by the delegates in the two conventions. Soon afterwards a delegation of ladies * waited on Winfield S. Hancock, the Democratic nominee, who received them with much courtesy, saying he was quite willing to interpret, in its broadest sense, that clause of his letter of acceptance wherein he said: "It is only by a full vote and a fair count that the people can rule in fact, as required by the theory of our government." "I am willing, ladies," said the general, "to have you say that I believe in a free ballot for all the people of the United States, women as well as men."

Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Slocum and Mr. Wilcox made quite an extensive canvass through many counties of the State, to rouse the women to use their right to vote on all school matters.

The bill to prohibit disfranchisement was again introduced in the legislature of 1881, by Joseph M. Congdon, and ordered to a third reading May 3, by a vote of 60 to 40, and on May 11 came up for final action, when the ladies, by special courtesy, were admitted to the floor of the Assembly chamber to listen to the discussion. General Francis B. Spinola and General James W. Husted made earnest speeches in favor of the bill, and Hon. Erastus Brooks and General George A. Sharpe in opposition. The roll-call gave 57 ayes to 55 noes—a majority of those present, but not the majority (65) of all the members of the Assembly, which the constitution of New York requires for the final passage of a bill. The vote astonished the opponents, and placed the measure among the grave questions of the day. This substantial success inspired the friends to renewed efforts.†

The necessity of properly qualified women in the police stations again came up for consideration. The condition of unfortunate women nightly consigned to these places had long been set forth by the leaders of the suffrage movement. In New York there were thirty-two station-houses in which, from night to night, from five to forty women were lodged, some on criminal charges, some from extreme poverty. All there, young and old, were entirely in the hands of men, in sickness or distress. If search was to be made on charge of theft, it was always a male official who performed the duty. If the most delicate and refined lady were

* Miss Helen Potter, Miss Susan A. King, Miss Helen M. Slocum, Miss Harriet K. Dolson and Mrs. Devereux Blake.

† Mrs. Rogers organized a society in Lansingburg, Mrs. Loder in Poughkeepsie, Miss Stoneman held meetings in Chautauqua county, Mrs. Howell in Livingston county, Mrs. Blake in ten other counties, and held several parlor meetings in New York city. The annual convention of the State society was held in Chickering Hall, February 1, 2, 1882.

Digitized by Google

taken ill on the street, or injured in any way, she was liable to be taken to the nearest station, where the needful examinations to ascertain if life yet lingered must be made by men. In view of these facts, a resolution was again passed at the State convention, and request made to the police commissioners, to permit a delegation of ladies to meet with them in conference. The commissioners deigned no reply, but gave the letter to the press, whereupon ensued a storm of comment and ridicule.

On consultation with Mrs. Josephine Shaw Lowell, commissioner of the State Board of Charities, a bill was drawn up and sent to Albany, providing for the appointment of one or more police-matrons at every station-house in cities of 50,000 inhabitants and upwards, the salaries to be $600 each. Hon. J. C. Boyd presented the bill in the Senate, where it passed April 18. In the Assembly its passage was urged by Hon. Michael C. Murphy, chairman of the Committee on Cities. Meantime Mayor Grace and Comptroller Campbell entered their protest against the bill, declaring the measure ought to originate in the city departments, where there was full power to appoint police-matrons; also, that the proposed salaries would be a heavy drain upon the city treasury. The comptroller was at once informed of the previous application to the police commissioners, from whom no reply had been received, which virtually compelled appeal to the legislature. And as to salaries, it was suggested that there were now on the pay-roll of the police of New York 2,500 men whose salaries amounted to over $2,500,000, whereas the bill before the legislature asked for only sixty matrons, whose salaries would amount to but $36,000. This was certainly a most reasonable demand for the protection of one-half the people of the city, who paid fully half the indirect taxes as well as a fair proportion of the direct taxes. Finally, it was proposed to the comptroller that the bill should be withdrawn if he would recommend the appointment of police-matrons in the city departments. This was not accepted. The Committee on Cities gave a hearing to Mrs. Blake, and reported unanimously in favor of the bill. Public sentiment supported the measure, the press generally advocated it, and the Assembly passed the bill by a vote of 96 to 7; but it failed to receive the signature of the governor,—a most striking proof of the need of the ballot for women; since, friendly as he was to woman's enfranchisement, when he found the police department, with its thousands of attachés, *all with votes* in their

Digitized by Google

hands, opposed, Governor Cornell was found wanting in courage and conscience to sign this bill for women who had no votes.* The next year application was again made to the city authorities for the appointment of matrons, but they refused to act. The bill was reintroduced in the legislature, passed by a large majority in the Assembly, but defeated in the Senate by the adverse report of the Committee on Cities. A mass-meeting to discuss this question of police-matrons was held in Steinway Hall, March 1, at which the speakers † all urged such appointments.

During the winter of 1882 an effort was made in New York city to secure the enforcement of the law enacted by the previous legislature, which provided that seats should be furnished for the "shop-girls." Mrs. Emma Gates Conkling caused the arrest of certain prominent shop-keepers on the charge of not complying with the law, but on coming to trial the suits were withdrawn on the promise of the delinquents to give seats to their employés.

During the winter of 1882 agitation for the higher education of women was renewed, and a society organized by some of the most influential ladies in the city. They rolled up a petition of 1,200, asking that Columbia College be opened to women. President Barnard had recommended this in his reports for three years. The agitation culminated in a grand meeting † in the new Union League Theater. Parke Godwin of the *Evening Post* presided. The audience was chiefly composed of fashionable ladies, whose equipages filled Thirty-eighth street blocks away, yet not a woman sat on the platform; not a woman's voice was heard; even the report of the society was read by a man, and every inspiration of the occasion was filtered through the brain of some man. Among other things, Mr. Godwin, son-in-law of the poet Bryant, said:

We speak of the higher education of women. Why not also of men? Because they already have the opportunity for obtaining it. The idea upon which our government is built is the idea of equal rights for all; and that means equal opportunities. Every society needs all the best intellect that it can get. We have many evil influences acting upon our society here, and we need the all-controlling influence of woman. We cannot fix a standard for her.. History shows what she has done, in a Vespasia, Vit-

* The press generally commented unfavorably. The *Herald* said: "The legislature passed a bill in the interest of decency and humanity, authorizing the appointment of matrons in the several police stations in the city of New York to look after female prisoners who might be placed in the station-houses. This bill was recommended by our best charitable and religious societies, but failed to receive the sanction of the governor, although he very promptly signed a bill to increase the number of the detective force."

† Mrs. Emma Gates Conkling, Mrs. Clara Neyman, Dr. Clemence Lozier and Mrs. Blake.

Digitized by Google

toria Colonna, De Staël, Bremer, Evans, Somerville and Maria Mitchell. She does not go out of her sphere when she is so highly educated. She can darn her stockings just as well if she does know the word in half-a-dozen languages. There is no longer novelty in this movement; it has been tried successfully here and abroad in the universities, and always with success.

Addresses were also made by Rev. Dr. Stowe, Dr. William Draper, Joseph Choate, and others eminent in one way or another. The meeting closed by circulating a petition for presentation to the trustees of Columbia College, asking that properly qualified women be admitted to lectures and examinations.

The bill to prohibit disfranchisement on account of sex was again introduced in the Assembly by Hon. J. Hampden Robb, and referred to the Committee on Grievances, of which Major James Haggerty was chairman, who gave to it his hearty approval and granted two hearings to the officers of the State society, on behalf of the large number of memorialists who had sent in their petitions from all parts of the State. The women of Albany were indefatigable in their personal appeals to the different members of the Assembly, urging them to vote for the bill, while Major Haggerty was untiring in his advocacy of the measure. On May 3 there was an animated discussion:* the bill passed to its third reading by an overwhelming vote, which alarmed the opponents into making a thorough canvass, that proved to them the necessity of some decisive action for the defeat of the bill. The Hon. Erastas Brooks presented a resolution, calling on the attorney-general for his opinion on the constitutionality of the proposed law, which was passed in a moment of confusion, and when many of our friends were absent. Following is the opinion elicited:

STATE OF NEW YORK, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL,
ALBANY, May 10, 1882.

To the Assembly:

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the resolution of the Assembly requesting the attorney-general to report his opinion as to the constitutionality of Assembly bill No. 637, which provides that "every woman shall be free to vote under the qualifications required of men, or to refrain from voting, as she may choose; and no person shall be debarred by reason of sex from voting at any election, or at any town meeting, school meeting, or other choice of government functionaries whatsoever," and whether, without an amendment to the constitution, suffrage

* Major Haggerty, ex-Governor Thomas G. Alvord and Hon. James D. McMellan in its favor; Hon. Erastus Brooks and General Sharpe against.

Digitized by Google

can be granted to any class of persons not named in the constitution. I reply:

First—It has been decided so often by the judicial tribunals of the various States of the Union, and by the Supreme Court of the United States, that suffrage is not a natural inherent right, but one governed by the law-making power and regulated by questions of availability and expediency, instead of absolute, inalienable right (1, 3), that the question is no longer open for discussion, either by the judicial forum or legislative assemblies (*Burnham vs. Laning, 1 Legal Gazette Rep., 411, Supreme Court Penn.; Minor vs. Happersett, 21 Wallace, 162; Day vs. Jones, 31 California, 261; Anderson vs. Baker, 23 Maryland, 531; Abbott vs. Bayley, 6 Pickering, 92; 2 Dallas, 471-2; In re Susan B. Anthony, 11 Blatchford, 200*). At the common law women had no right to vote and no political status (2, 4) (*Maine's Ancient Law, 140; Cooley's Const. Lim., 599; Blackstone's Comm., 171*).

Second—Therefore the constitution of the State of New York, providing that every male citizen of the age of 21 years who shall have certain other qualifications, may vote, the determination of the organic law specifying who shall have the privilege of voting, excludes all other classes (5), such as women, persons under 21 years of age and aliens. The argument that, because women are not expressly prohibited, they may vote, fails to give the slightest force to the term "male" in the constitution; and by the same force of reasoning, the expression of the term "citizen" and the statement of the age of 21 years would not necessarily exclude aliens and those under 21 years of age from voting (6). Therefore, assuming that our organic law was properly adopted without the participation of women either in making or adopting it (7), that organic law controls.

Third—It follows, therefore, as a logical consequence that the proposed reform cannot be accomplished except by an amendment of the constitution ratified by two successive legislatures and the people, or by a constitutional convention, whose work shall be sanctioned by a vote of the people. LESLIE W. RUSSELL, *Attorney-General.**

Weak as was this document, and untenable as were its assertions, it had great weight with many of the members of the legislature coming as the opinion did from the attorney-general of the State. The friends of the bill resolved to call for the vote when the bill should be reached, and on May 16, the women were present in large numbers, listening with intense interest to the brief speeches of the members for and against, and watching and counting the vote as the roll-call proceeded, which resulted in 54 ayes and 59 noes, lacking three votes of a majority of those present and only eleven of the requisite number, sixty-five. In view of the official opinion against its constitutionality amounting to a legal decision, this was a most gratifying vote.†

* Mr. Hamilton Wilcox at once prepared an able paper, refuting the attorney-general's assertion. It was widely circulated throughout the State.

† When the vote was announced, the ladies sent the pages with bouquets to the leading speakers in behalf of the bill, and button-hole sprigs to the fifty-four who voted aye.

Digitized by Google

The presence of Leslie W. Russell in Albany, as attorney-general, rendered it useless to reïntroduce the bill to prohibit disfranchisement on account of sex in the legislature of 1883, but in its stead, Dr. John G. Boyd of New York introduced a proposition to strike "male" from the suffrage clause of the constitution, which, however, received only fifteen votes.

To pass from the State to the Church, the winter of 1883 was notable for the delivery of a series of Lenten lectures on woman by the Rev. Morgan Dix, D. D., rector of Trinity Church, New York, afterwards published in book form under the title, "The Calling of a Christian Woman and her Training to Fulfill it." The lectures were delivered each Friday evening during Lent, in Trinity Chapel, and at once attracted attention from their conservative, reäctionary, almost monastic views of woman's position and duties.

After reading a report of one of these remarkable essays in which women were gravely told their highest happiness should be found in singing hymns, Mrs. Blake decided to reply to them. She secured a hall on Fourteenth street, and on successive Sunday evenings gave addresses in reply. Both courses of lectures were well attended. The moderate audiences of Trinity Chapel soon became a throng that more than filled the large building, while the hall in which Mrs. Blake spoke was packed to suffocation, hundreds going away unable to gain admittance. The press everywhere favored the broad and liberal views presented by Mrs. Blake, and denounced the old-time narrow theories of Dr. Dix. Mrs. Blake's lectures were also published in book form with the title of "Woman's Place To-day" and had a large circulation.

The Republicans again nominating Mr. Russell for attorney-general, an active campaign was organized against him and in favor of the Democratic nominee, Mr. Dennis O'Brien. Protests*

---

* *To the Women of the State of New York:*

The undersigned urge you to exert yourselves to turn every vote possible against Leslie W. Russell's reëlection as attorney-general. His official acts prove him the unscrupulous foe of your liberties. By informing the legislature that you have no right to vote at common law, he has denied your sacred rights and misrepresented the law to your hurt. By stating that you have no natural right to vote, he has denied your title to freedom and sought to keep your rights at the mercy of those in power. By informing the legislature that the bill to repeal the statutes which keep you from voting was unconstitutional he misled the legislature and kept you disfranchised. By thus continuing your disfranchisement, he has subjected you to many misfortunes and wrongs which the repeal of your disfranchisement would cure, and is personally responsible for these sufferings. He has also sought to rob the mothers of this State of their votes at school elections, and thus to deprive them of the power to control their children's education.

[Signed:] Clemence S. Lozier, M. D., New York; Mary R. Pell, Queens; Lillie Devereux Blake, New York; Caroline A. Bassett, Erie; Susan A. King, New York; Lucy Shawler, Chenango; Mary E. Tallman, Oneida; Hannah M. Angel, Allegany; Ida Louise Dildine, Broome; Zerivah L. Watkeys.

against Russell were circulated throughout the State; Republican tickets were printed with the name of Denis O'Brien for attorney-general, and on election day women distributed these tickets, and made every possible effort to ensure the defeat of Russell; and he was defeated by 13,000 votes.

The legislature of 1884 showed a marked gain; Hon. Erastus Brooks, General George A. Sharpe, and other prominent opponents had been retired, and their seats filled by active friends. Our bill was introduced by Mr. William Howland of Cayuga, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. Howland also secured the passage of a special act, granting women the right to vote at the charter elections of Union Springs, Cayuga county. Under similar enactments women have the right to vote for municipal officers in Dansville, Newport and other villages and towns in the State.

On March 11, 12, the annual meeting of the State society was held in the City Hall, Albany, with a good representation * from the National Convention at Washington, added to our own State speakers.† On the last evening there was an overflow meeting held in Geological Hall, presided over by Mrs. Matilda Joslyn Gage.

Governor Cleveland accorded the delegates a most courteous reception in his room in the capitol. A hearing was had before the Judiciary Committee March 13. The assembly-chamber was crowded. General Husted, chairman of the committee, presided, and Mrs. Blake, the president of the society, introduced the speakers.‡ A few days later the same committee gave a special

---

Onondaga; Asenath C. Coolidge, Jefferson; Sarah H. Hallock, Ulster; N. W. Cooper, Jefferson, and others.

To the Republican and Independent Voters of the State of New York:

The undersigned earnestly ask you to cast your votes against Leslie W. Russell, the present attorney-general. When the legislature last year was about to repeal the election laws which prevent women from exercising the right of suffrage, Leslie W. Russell stated to that body that women had no right at common law to vote, and that this bill was unconstitutional. By these misstatements he misled the legislature, defeated this most righteous bill and prolonged the disfranchisement of women. Thus he inflicted on a majority of our adult citizens, who had committed no offense, the penalty of disfranchisement and the great mischiefs which flow thence, and, like Judge Taney in the Dred-Scott decision, perverted law and constitution to justify injustice and continue wrong. A vote for Leslie W. Russell is a vote to keep these women disfranchised and to prolong these mischiefs. He who thus blocks the way of freedom should be removed from the place which enables him to do this. You can vote at this election for fifteen or more officers. It is but a small thing to ask, that each of you cast one-fifteenth part of his vote to represent women's interest at the polls.

[Signed:] Clemence S. Lozier, M. D., Bronson Murray, Susan A. King, Hamilton Wilcox, Lillie Devereux Blake, Albert O. Wilcox.

* Abigail Scott Duniway, editor *New Northwest*, Oregon; Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, editor "Woman's Kingdom," Chicago *Inter-Ocean*; Helen M. Gougar, editor *Our Herald*, Indiana.

† On the evening of March 8 the New York city society gave a reception in honor of the delegates to the National Convention, recently held at Washington, in the elegant parlors of the Hoffman House.

‡ Mrs. Gage, Mrs. Howell, Mrs. Rogers, Mrs. Duniway and Mrs. Gougar.

hearing to Mrs. Gougar, who made the journey from Indiana to present the case. The committee reported adversely, but by the able tactics of General Husted, after an animated debate the bill was placed on the calendar by a vote of 66 to 62, and shortly after ordered to a third reading by a vote of 74 to 39. On May 8 the bill was reached for final action. Frederick B. Howe of New York was the principal opponent, trying to obstruct legislation by one and another pretext. General Husted took the floor in an able speech on the constitutionality of the bill, and the vote stood 57 ayes to 61 noes, lacking eight votes of the requisite 65.

While the right of suffrage is still denied, gains in personal and property rights have been granted:

In 1880, the law requiring the private acknowledgment by a married woman of her execution of deeds, or other written instruments, without the "fear or compulsion" of her husband, was abolished, leaving the wife to make, take and certify in the same manner as if she were a *feme sole.*

March 21, 1884, the penal code of the State was amended, raising the age of consent from ten to sixteen years, and also providing penalties* for inveigling or enticing any unmarried woman, under the age of twenty-five years, into a house of ill-fame or assignation.

Under the act of May 28, 1884, a married woman may contract to the same extent, with like effect and in the same form as if unmarried, and she and her separate estate shall be liable thereon, whether such contract relates to her separate business or estate, or otherwise, and in no case shall a charge upon her separate estate be necessary.

It is by court decisions that we most readily learn the legal status of married women, under the favorable legislation of the period covered by this History. While referring the reader to Abbott's Digest of New York Laws for full knowledge upon this point, we give a few of the more recent decisions as illustrating general legal opinion:

TROY, March 23, 1882.—The Court of Appeals decided that married women are the rightful owners of articles of personal adornment or convenience coming from husbands, and can bequeath them to their heirs. The court held that separate and personal possession by a wife of articles specially fitted for and adapted to her personal use, and differing in that respect from household goods kept for the common use of husband and wife, would draw after it a presumption of the executed gift if the property came from the husband, and of the wife's ownership, but for disabilities of the marital relations. Now that these disabilities are removed the separate existence and separate property of the wife are recognized, and her capacity to take and hold as her own the gift in good faith and fairly made to her by her husband established, it seemed to the court time to clothe her right with natural and proper attributes, and apply to the gift to her, although made by her husband, the general rules of law unmodified and unimpaired by the old disabilities of the marriage relations.

* Imprisonment for not more than five years, or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

Digitized by Google

This decision was important as further destroying the old common-law theory of the husband's absolute ownership of his wife's person, property, services and earnings. The same year (1882) the Supreme Court, at its general term, rendered a decision that a married woman could sue her husband for damages for assault and battery; that by the act of 1860 the legislature intended to, and did, change the common-law rule, that a wife could not sue her husband. Judge Brady rendered the opinion, Judge Daniels concurring; Presiding Judge Noah Davis dissenting. Judge Brady said:

To allow the right (to sue) in an action of this character, in accordance with the language of the statute, would be to promote greater harmony by enlarging the rights of married women and increasing the obligations of husbands, by affording greater protection to the former, and by enforcing greater restraint upon the latter in the indulgence of their evil passions. The declaration of such a rule is not against the policy of the law. It is in harmony with it, and calculated to preserve peace and, in a great measure, prevent barbarous acts, acts of cruelty, regarded by mankind as inexcusable, contemptible, detestable. It is neither too early nor too late to promulgate the doctrine that if a husband commits an assault and battery upon his wife he may be held responsible civilly and criminally for the act, which is not only committed in violation of the laws of God and man, but in direct antagonism to the contract of marriage, its obligations, duties, responsibilities, and the very basis on which it rests. The rules of the common law on this subject have been dispelled, routed, and justly so, by the acts of 1860 and 1862. They are things of the past which have succumbed to more liberal and just views, like many other doctrines of the common law which could not stand the scrutiny and analysis of modern civilization.

The utter insecurity of woman without the ballot is shown in the reversal of this decision within a few months, by the Court of Appeals, on the ground that it would be "contrary to the policy of the law, and destructive to the conjugal union and tranquility which it had always been the object of the law to guard and protect." Could satire go farther? We record with satisfaction the fact that Judge Danforth uttered a strong dissenting opinion.

The friends of woman suffrage in the legislature of 1884 secured the passage of a bill empowering women to vote on all questions of taxation submitted to a popular vote in the village of Union Springs. Governor Cleveland was urged to veto it; but after hearing all the objections he signed the bill and it became a law.

At Clinton, Oneida county, twenty-two women voted on June 21, 1884, at an election on the question of establishing waterworks. Eight voted for the tax, fourteen against it. Fifteen other women appeared at the polls, but were excluded from voting because, though they were real-estate tax-payers, the asses-

Digitized by Google

sor had left their names off the tax-roll. Judge Theodore W. Dwight, president of the Columbia Law School, pronounced women tax-payers entitled to vote under the general water-works act, and therefore that the election-officials violated the law in refusing to accept the votes of the women whose names were omitted from the assessors' tax-list.

In 1879, there was a report of the committee to allow widows an active voice in the settlement of the family estate and to have the sole guardianship of minor children. A petition in favor of the bill had upon it the names of such well-known men as Peter Cooper, George William Curtis, Henry Bergh and J. W. Simonton.

September 13, 1879, Mrs. MacDonald of Boston argued her own case before the United States Circuit Court in New York city, in a patent suit. It was a marked event in court circles, she being the first lady pleader that ever appeared in that court, and the second woman who ever argued a case in this State. Anne Bradstreet was for years a marked character in Albany courts, but her claims for justice were regarded as an amusing lunacy.

In 1880, Governor Cornell appointed Miss Carpenter on the State Board of Charities.

In the suit of Mr. Edward Jones to recover $860 which he alleged he had loaned to the Rev. Anna Oliver for the Willoughby Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, Brooklyn, of which she was pastor, a verdict for the defendant was rendered. Miss Oliver addressed the following letter to the court:

To his Honor, the Judge, the Intelligent Jury, the Lawyers and all who are engaged in the case of Jones vs. Oliver:

GENTLEMEN:—Thanking you for the politeness, the courtesy, the chivalry even, that has been shown me to-day, allow me to make of you the following request: Please sit down at your earliest leisure, and endeavor to realize in imagination how you would feel if you were sued by a woman, and the case was brought before a court composed entirely of women; the judge a woman; every member of the jury a woman; women to read the oath to you, and hold the Bible, and every lawyer a woman. Further, your case to be tried under laws framed entirely by women, in which neither you nor any man had ever been allowed a voice. Somewhat as you would feel under such circumstances, you may be assured, on reading this, I have felt during the trial to-day. Perhaps the women would be lenient to you (the sexes do favor each other), but would you be satisfied? Would you feel that such an arrangement was exactly the just and fair thing? If you would not, I ask you on the principle of the Golden Rule, to use your influence for the enfranchisement of women.

New York, 1881.

Mrs. Roebling, wife of the engineer in charge of the construction of the marvelous Brooklyn bridge, made the patterns for various necessary shapes of iron and steel such as no mills were

making, after her husband and other engineers had for weeks puzzled their brains over the difficulties.

When Frank Leslie died, his printing-house was involved, and Mrs. Leslie undertook to reedeem it, which she did, and in a very short time. Speaking of it she says:

"I had the property in reach, and the assignees were ready to turn it over to me, but to get it, it was necessary for me to raise $50,000. I borrowed it from a woman. How happy I was when she signed the check, and how beautiful it seemed to me to see one woman helping another. I borrowed the money in June, and was to make the first payment of $5,000, on the 1st of November. On the 29th of October I paid the $50,000 with interest. From June to the 29th of October, I made $50,000 clear. I had also to pay $30,000 to the creditors who did not come under the contract. While I was paying this $80,000 of my husband's debts, I spent but $30 for myself, except for my board. I lived in a little attic room, without a carpet, and the window was so high that I could not get a glimpse of the sky unless I stood on a chair and looked out. When I had paid the debts and raised a monument to my husband, then I said to myself, 'now for a great big pair of diamond earrings,' and away I went to Europe, and here are the diamonds." The diamonds are perfect matches, twenty-seven carats in weight, and are nearly as large as nickles.

In Lansingburgh the women tax-payers offered their ballots and were repulsed, as follows:

September 2, 1885, the special election of the taxable inhabitants of the village of Lansingburgh took place, to vote upon a proposition to raise by tax the sum of $15,000 for water-works purposes. The measure was voted by 102 for it to 46 against. But a small amount of interest was manifested in the election. Several women tax-payers offered their votes, but the inspectors would not receive them, and the matter will be contested in the courts. The call for the election asked for an expression from "the taxable inhabitants," and women tax-payers in the 'burgh claim under the law their rights must be recognized. Lansingburgh inspectors have on numerous occasions refused to receive the ballots thus tendered, and the women have lost patience. They are to employ the best of counsel and settle the question at as early a day as possible. Women pay tax upon $367,394 of the property within the village boundaries, and they believe that they, to the number of 317 at least, are entitled to votes on all questions involving a monetary expenditure. In Saratoga, Clinton, and a number of other places in this State, where elections in relation to water-works have taken place, it has been held by legal authority that women property owners have a right to vote, and they have voted accordingly the same as other tax-payers.

In regard to recent efforts to secure legislation favorable to women, Mr. Wilcox writes:

The impression that the School Act, passed in 1880, did not apply to cities, led to the introduction by the Hon. Charles S. Baker of Rochester, of a bill covering cities. A test vote showed the Assembly practically unanimous for it, but it was referred to the Judiciary Committee to examine its constitutionality. The chairman, Hon. Geo. L. Ferry, and other members,

Digitized by Google

asked me to look up the point and inform the committee, supposing a constitutional amendment needful. When the point was made on this bill, I for the first time closely examined the constitution, and finding there was nought to prevent the legislature enfranchising anyone, promptly apprised the committee of the discovery. The acting-chairman, Major Wm. D. Brennan, requested me to furnish the committee a legal brief on the matter. This (Feb. 19, 1880) I did, and arranged a public hearing before them in the assembly-chamber, which was attended by Governor Cornell, Lieutenant-Governor Hoskins, many senators, assemblymen, and State officers; at which Mrs. Blake, the sainted Helen M. Slocum and Mrs. Elizabeth L. Saxon were the speakers. From that year to the present there has been a "Bill to Prohibit Disfranchisement" before each legislature. In 1881, it was carried to a majority vote in the Assembly. In 1883, two-thirds of the Assembly were ready to pass the bill when the attorney-general declared it unconstitutional. In 1884, Governor Cleveland had approved two suffrage acts, and promised to sign all the friends could carry. In 1885, growing tired of the senseless clamor of "unconstitutionality," I resolved to show how little law the clamorers knew. To the knowledge gained by five years' discussion, I added that obtained by several months' research in the State Library at Albany, that of the New York Bar Association, those of the New York Law Institute and Columbia College, and elsewhere. The result was the publication of "Cases of the Legislature's Power over Suffrage," wherein it was shown, condensed from a great number of authorities, that all classes have received suffrage, not from the constitution but from the legislature, and that the latter has exercised the power of extending suffrage in hundreds of cases. This document received high praise from General James W. Husted and Major James Haggerty, who have manfully championed our bills in the Assembly, General Husted reading from it in his speech and it was signally sanctioned by the Assembly which, after being supplied with copies, voted down by more than three to one a motion to substitute a constitutional amendment.

But while working at this document, I was fortunate enough to make a still greater discovery—that portions of statute law which formerly prevented women's voting were repealed long since; that the constitution and statutes in their present shape secure women the legal right to vote.

February 19, 1885, a hearing was granted to Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Rogers and Mrs. Blake in the assembly-chamber before the Committee on Grievances, on the "Bill to Prohibit Disfranchisement." The splendid auditorium was crowded for two hours, and members of the committee lingered a long time after the audience had dispersed to discuss the whole question still further with the speakers. On the next day Mrs. Mary Seymour Howell and Governor John W. Hoyt of Wyoming Territory had a second hearing. The committee reported for consideration. When the bill came up for a

Digitized by Google

third reading, General Martin L. Curtis of St. Lawrence moved that it be sent to the Judiciary Committee with instructions to substitute a constitutional amendment; lost, ayes 25, noes 75; carried to a third reading by *viva voce* vote. The vote on the final passage was, ayes 57, noes 56; the constitutional majority in this State being 65 of the 128 members, it was lost by eight votes. Of the 73 Republicans, 29 voted for the bill; of the 55 Democrats, 28 voted for the bill, showing that more than half the Democratic vote was in favor, and only two-fifths of the Republican; thus our defeat was due to the Republican party.

Thus stands the question of woman suffrage in the Empire State to-day, where women are in the majority.* After long years of unremitting efforts who can read this chapter of woman's faith and patience, under such oft-repeated disappointments, but with pity for her humiliations and admiration for her courage and persistence. For nearly half a century the petitions, the appeals, the arguments of the women of New York have been before the legislature for consideration, and the trivial concessions of justice thus far wrung from our rulers bear no proportion to the prolonged labors we have gone through to achieve them.

* The last census shows there are 72,224 more women than men in New York; that there are 360,381 women and girls over ten years of age who support themselves by work outside their own homes, not including the house-keepers who, from the raw material brought into the family, manufacture food and clothing three times its original value.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Carrie Burnham—The Canon and Civil Law the Source of Woman's Degradation—Women Sold with Cattle in 1768—Women Arrested in Pittsburgh—Mrs. McManus—Opposition to Women in the Colleges and Hospitals; John W. Forney Vindicates their Rights—Ann Preston—Women in Dentistry—James Truman's Letter—Swarthmore College—Suffrage Association Formed in 1866, in Philadelphia—John K. Wildman's Letter—Judge William S. Pierce—The Citizens' Suffrage Association, 333 Walnut Street, Edward M. Davis, President—Petitions to the Legislature—Constitutional Convention, 1873—Bishop Simpson, Mary Grew, Sarah C. Hallowell, Matilda Hindman, Mrs. Stanton, Address the Convention—Messrs. Broomall and Campbell Debate With the Opposition—Amendment Making Women Eligible to School Offices—Two Women Elected to Philadelphia School Board, 1874—The Wages of Married Women Protected—J. Edgar Thomson's Will—Literary Women as Editors—The Rev. Knox Little—Anne E. McDowell—Women as Physicians in Insane Asylums—The Fourteenth Amendment Resolution, 1881—Ex-Governor Hoyt's Lecture on Wyoming.

In the demand for the right of suffrage, women are constantly asked by the opposition if they cannot trust their own fathers, husbands and brothers to legislate for them. The answer to this question may be found in an able digest of the old common laws and the Revised Statutes of Pennsylvania,* prepared by Carrie S. Burnham † of Pennsylvania. A careful perusal of this paper will show the relative position of man and woman to be that of sovereign and subject.

To get at the real sentiments of a people in regard to the true status of woman we must read the canon and civil laws that form the basic principles of their religion and government. We must not trust to the feelings and actions of the best men towards the individual women whom they may chance to love and respect. The chivalry and courtesy that the few command through their beauty, wealth and position, are one thing; but justice, equality, liberty for the multitude, are quite another. And when the few,

* See Appendix,

† Carrie S. Burnham after long years of preparation and persistent effort for admission to the bar of Philadelphia, was admitted in 1884. She was thorougly qualified to enter that profession and to practice in the courts of that State, and the only reason ever offered for her rejection from time to time was, "that she was a woman."

Digitized by Google

through misfortune, are made to feel the iron teeth of the law, they regret that they had not used their power to secure permanent protection under just laws, rather than to have trusted the transient favors of individuals to shield them in life's emergencies.

The law securing to married women the right to property,* inherited by will or bequest, passed the legislature of Pennsylvania, and was approved by the governor April 11, 1848, just five days after a similar law had been passed in New York. Judge Bovier was the mover for the Pennsylvania Married Women's Property Law. His feelings had been so often outraged with the misery caused by men marrying women for their property, that he was bound the law should be repealed. He prevailed on several young Quakers who had rich sisters, to run for the legislature. They were elected and did their duty. Judge Bovier was a descendent of the Waldenses, a society of French Quakers who fled to the mountains from persecution. Their descendants are still living in France.†

The disabilities and degradation that women suffer to-day grow out of the spirit of laws that date from a time when women were viewed in the light of beasts of burden. Scarce a century has passed since women were sold in this country with cattle. In the *Pennsylvania Gazette* for January 7, 1768, is the following advertisement:

To Be Seen.—At the Crooked Billet, near the Court-house, Philadelphia (Price Three Pence), A Two Year Old Hogg, 12 Hands high, and in length 16 Feet; thought to be the largest of its Kind ever seen in America.

In the same paper of the following week occurs this yet more extraordinary announcement:

To Be Sold.—A Healthy Young Dutch Woman, fit for town or country business; about 18 years old; can spin well; she speaks good English, and has about five years to serve. Inquire at James Der Kinderen's, Strawberry alley.

In one century of growth a woman's sewing machine was better protected than the woman herself under the old common law:

An Act *to exempt Sewing Machines belonging to Seamstresses in this Commonwealth from levy and sale on execution or distress for rent:*

Section 1. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania in general assembly met, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same, That hereafter all sewing machines belonging to seamstresses in this commonwealth shall be exempt from levy and sale on execution or distress for rent, in addition to any article or money now exempt by law. Approved, April 17, 1869.

---

* By an oversight this law was not mentioned in Vol. I. in its proper place.

† George W. Childs married Judge Bovier's grand-daughter.

While the following order reflects the spirit of the seventeenth century, the comments show the dawning of the right idea, and are worthy the time in which the great State of Pennsylvania could boast such women as Lucretia Mott, Anna E. Dickinson, Jane G. Swisshelm and Sarah J. Hale:

A WOMAN ORDER IN PITTSBURGH.—The mayor of Pittsburgh has ordered the arrest of every woman found on the streets alone after 9 o'clock in the evening; the consequence of which has been that some respectable ladies have recently seen the inside of the lock-up.—*Exchange, June, 1869.*

Now let the mothers, wives and daughters of Pittsburgh obtain the passage, by the city council, of an ordinance causing the arrest of every *man* found in the streets after 9 o'clock in the evening, and the law will then be equal in its operation. This legislating upon the behavior of one sex by the other exclusively, is one-sided and despotic. Give both sexes a chance at reforming each other.

Another step in progress was indicated by the assumption of some women to influence civil administration, not only for their own protection, but for that of their sires and sons:

An exchange says that women are becoming perfect nuisances, and to substantiate the assertion adds that 1,500 women in Chester county, Pennsylvania, have petitioned the court to grant no more liquor licenses.

Suppose wives should come reeling home, night after night, with curses on their lips, to destroy the food, the dishes, the furniture for which husbands toiled; to abuse trembling children, making the home, from year to year, a pandemonium on earth—would the good men properly be called "nuisances," who should rise up and say this must end; we must protect our firesides, our children, ourselves, society at large? To have women even suggest such beneficent laws for the men of their families is called "a nuisance," while the whole barbarous code for women was declared by Lord Coke to be the "perfection of reason."

The prejudice against sex has been as bitter and unreasonable as against color, and far more reprehensible, because in too many cases it has been a contest between the inferior, with law on his side, and the superior, with law and custom against her, as the following facts in the *Sunday Dispatch*, by Anne E. McDowell, fully show:

The decision of the Court of Common Pleas in the case of Mrs. McManus, elected principal of the Mount Vernon Boys' Grammar School, is to the effect that, no rule being in existence prohibiting the exercise of the duties of such office by a woman, the resolution of the controllers against the exercise of the duties of that office by the lady was unjustifiable and illegal. Since the decision was pronounced the controllers have come up to the boundary of the principle held by the court, and a rule has been proposed that in future women shall be ineligible to be principals of boys' grammar schools—the case of Mrs. McManus being specially excepted. That lady, therefore, will be undisturbed. But she may be, like the celebrated "Lady Freemason," an exception to her sex. The controllers have not favored the public with their reasons

Digitized by Google

for opposition to the employment of females in the higher positions of teaching. Women are good enough for inferior service about a boys' grammar-school, it seems, but they are not capable of superintending it. They may be, and are, teachers in all the classes in such schools, even to the highest; but when the question arises whether a woman, perfectly competent, shall be superintendent of all the classes—for a principal is little more—the controllers say *no*. If this action is influenced by a belief that women cannot control a school of boys, we hope that the experience in the case of Mrs. McManus will dispel the illusion, and the public can afford to await the result of the trial. But if it is caused by a regard to tradition or precedent, or because there never has yet been an instance of a woman being a principal of a boys' grammar-school before this case of Mrs. McManus, we hope that the controllers will soon see the error of their course. The complaints from the sections are to the effect that it is very difficult to get a competent male teacher to remain principal of a boys' grammar-school for any length of time. The salary attached to that position is inadequate, according to the increased cost of living of the times. Gentlemen who are competent to act as principals of the public schools find that they can make more money by establishing private schools; and hence they are uneasy and dissatisfied while in the public service. A woman able to take charge of a boys' grammar-school will be paid a more liberal salary (such is the injustice of our social system in relation to female labor) in that position than in any other connected with education that she can command, and she will therefore be likely to be better satisfied with the duties and to perform them more properly. That such advantage ought to be held out to ladies competent to be teachers of the highest grade, we firmly believe. The field of female avocations should be extended in every legitimate direction; and it seems to us, unless some reason can be given for the exception, which has not yet been presented in the case of Mrs. McManus, that the principalships of the boys' grammar-schools ought to be accessible to ladies of the proper character and qualification, without the imputation that by reason of their sex they must necessarily be unfitted for such duties.

In preparing themselves for the medical profession, for which the most conservative people now admit that women are peculiarly adapted, students have encountered years of opposition, ridicule and persecution. After a college for women was established in Philadelphia,* there was another long struggle before their right to attend the clinics in the hospitals was accorded. The faculty and students alike protested against the admission of women into mixed classes; but as there was no provision to give them the clinics alone, a protest against mixed classes was a protest against such advantages to women altogether. One would have supposed the men might have left the delicacy of the question to the decision of the women themselves. But in this struggle for education men have always been more concerned about the loss of modesty than the acquirement of knowledge and wisdom. From the opinions usually expressed by these self-constituted guardians of the feminine character, we might be led to infer that the virtues of women were not a part of the essential elements of their organization, but a sort of temporary scaffolding, erected by society to shield a naturally weak structure that any wind could readily demolish.

At a meeting convened November 15 at the University of Pennsylvania, to consider the subject of clinical instruction to mixed classes the following remonstrance was unanimously adopted:

The undersigned, professors in the University of Pennsylvania, professors in Jefferson Medical College, members of the medical staff of various hospitals of Philadelphia, and members of the medical profession in Philadelphia at large, out of respect for their profession, and for the interests of the public, do feel it to be their duty, at the present time, to express their convictions upon the subject of "clinical instruction to *mixed classes* of male and female students of medicine." They are induced to present their views on this question, which is of so grave importance to medical education, from the fact that it is misunderstood by the public, and because an attempt is now being made to force it before the community in a shape which they conceive to be injurious to the progress of medical science, and to the efficiency of clinical teaching. They have no hesitation in declaring that their deliberate conviction is adverse to conducting clinical instruction in the presence of students of *both sexes*. The judgment that has been arrived at is based upon the following considerations:

I. Clinical instruction in practical medicine demands an examination of all the organs and parts of the body, as far as practicable; hence, personal exposure becomes for this purpose often a matter of absolute necessity. It cannot be assumed, by any right-minded person, that male patients should be subjected to inspection before a class of females, although this inspection may, without impropriety, be submitted to before those of their own sex. A thorough investigation, as well as demonstration, in these cases—so necessary to render instruction complete and effective—is, by a mixed audience, precluded; while the clinical lecturer is restrained and embarrassed in his inquiries, and must therefore fall short in the conclusions which he may draw, and in the instruction which he communicates.

II. In many operations upon male patients exposure of the body is inevitable, and demonstrations must be made which are unfitted for the observation of students of the opposite sex. These expositions, when made under the eye of such a conjoined assemblage, are shocking to the sense of decency, and entail the risk of unmanning the surgeon—of distracting his mind, and endangering the life of his patient. Besides this, a large class of surgical diseases of the male is of so delicate a nature as altogether to forbid inspection by female students. Yet a complete understanding of this particular class of diseases is of preëminent importance to the community. Moreover, such affections can be thoroughly studied only in the clinics of the large cities, and the opportunity for studying them, so far from being curtailed, should be extended to the utmost possible degree. To those who are familiar with such cases as are here alluded to, it is inconceivable that females should ever be called to their treatment.

III. By the joint participation, on the part of male and female students, in the instruction and in the demonstrations which properly belong to the clinical lecture-room, the barrier of respect is broken down, and that high estimation of womanly qualities, which should always be sustained and cherished, and which has its origin in domestic and social associations, is lost, by an inevitable and positive demoralization of the individuals concerned, thereby entailing most serious detriment to the morals of society. In view of the above consideratious, the undersigned * do earnestly and sol-

---

* *University of Pennsylvania*—Joseph Carson, Robert E. Rogers, Joseph Leidy, Henry H. Smith, Francis G. Smith, R. A. T. Penrose, Alfred Stille, George B. Wood, Samuel Jackson, Hugh L. Hodge, R. La Roche, George W. Norris. *Jefferson Medical College*—Joseph Pancoast, S. D. Gross, Samuel Henry Dickson, Ellerslie Wallace, B. Howard Rand, John B. Biddle, James Aitken Meigs. *Pennsylvania Hospital*—J. Forsyth Meigs, James H. Hutchinson, J. M. Da Costa, Addinell Hewson, William Hunt, D. Hayes Agnew. *Philadelphia Hospital*—R. J. Levis, William H. Pancoast, F. F. Maury, Alfred Stille, J. L. Ludlow, Edward Rhodes, D. D. Richardson, E. L. Duer, E. Scholfield, R. M. Girvin, John S. Parry, William Pepper, James Tyson. *Medical Staff of Episcopal Hospital*—John H. Packard, John Ashhurst, jr., Samuel Ashhurst, Alfred M. Slocum, Edward A. Smith, William

emnly protest against the admixture of the sexes at clinical instruction in medicine and surgery, and do respectfully lay these their views before the board of managers of the hospitals in Philadelphia.

November 15, 1869.

At meetings held at the University and Jefferson Medical Colleges, by the students, on Wednesday evening, the following preambles and resolutions were adopted:

WHEREAS, The managers of the Pennsylvania Hopsital have seen fit to admit female students to the clinics of that establishment, thereby excluding from the lectures many cases, medical and surgical; and

WHEREAS, We consider that in our purchase of tickets of admission there was a tacit agreement that we should have the benefit of all cases which the medical and surgical staff of that hospital should deem fit for our instruction:

Resolved, That a respectful request be made to the managers of the Pennsylvania Hospital that we be informed as to whether the usual character of the clinics will be changed.

Resolved, That pending the action of the managers on this question, we as a class and individually absent ourselves from the clinical lectures. And

WHEREAS, The levity of a few thoughtless young men in the presence of the females at the hospital has caused the journals of this city to assume that the whole class of medical students are utterly devoid of all the attributes of gentlemen,

Resolved, That while we do not by any means concede that the published accounts of the affair are correct, we deplore the fact that *any* demonstration should have taken place; for although the female students may be considered by their presence at the hospital where male students are present, to have cast aside that delicacy and modesty which constitutes the ægis of their sex, they are women, and as such demand our forbearance, if not our respect.

Resolved, That these preambles and resolutions be published in some respectable journal of this city.*

On these remonstrances of the faculty and students, *The Press*, John W. Forney, editor, had many able editorials condemning the

---

Thomson, William S. Forbes. *Wills Hospital for the Blind and Lame*—Thomas George Morton, A. D. Hall, Harrison Allen, George C. Harlan, R. J. Levis. *St. Joseph's Hospital*—William V. Keating, Alfred Stille, John J. Reese, George R. Morehouse, A. C. Bournonville, Edward A. Page, John H. Brinton, Walter F. Atlee, C. S. Boker. *St. Mary's Hospital*—C. Percy La Roche, J. Cummiskey, A. H. Fish, J. H. Grove, W. W. Keen, W. L. Wells, L. S. Bolles. *German Hospital*—Albert Fricke, Emil Fischer, Joseph F. Koerper, Julius Schrotz, Julius Kamerer, Karl Beeken, Theodore A. Demme. *Children's Hospital*—Thomas Hewson Bache, D. Murray Cheston, H. Lenox Hodge, F. W. Lewis, Hilborn West. *Charity Hospital*—A. H. Fish. L. K. Baldwin, Horace Y. Evans, John M. McGrath, H. St. Clair Ash, J. M. Boisnot, N. Hatfield, W. M. Welch, H. Lycurgus Law, H. Leaman, J. A. McArthur. *Howard Hospital*—Thomas S. Harper, Laurence Turnbull, T. H. Andrews, Horace Williams, Joseph Klapp, William B. Atkinson, S. C. Brincklee. *Physicians-at-Large of the City of Philadelphia*—E. Ward, George H. Beaumont, William W. Lamb, Thomas B. Reed, Charles Schaffer, J. Heritage, W. Stump Forwood, W. J. Phelps, Richard Maris, Frank Muhlenberg, George M. Ward, James Collins, William F. Norris, Samuel Lewis, Isaac Hays, G. Emerson, W. W. Gerhard, Caspar Morris, B. H. Coates, George Strawbridge, S. Weir Mitchell, I. Minis Hays, Edward B. Van Dyke, J. Sylvester Ramsey, G. W. Bowman, W. H. H. Githens, T. W. Lewis, T. M. Finley, S. W. Butler, Robert P. Harris, C. Moehring, George L. Bomberger, Philip Leidy, D. F. Willard, James V. Ingham, Edward Hartshorne, W. S. W. Ruschenberger, Thomas Stewardson, James Darrach, S. L. Hollingworth, William Mayburry, Lewis Rodman, Casper Wister, A. Nebinger, Horace Binney Hare, Edward Shippen, S. Littell, F. W. Lewis, Robert Bridges, William H. Gloninger, James Markoe, Charles Hunter, D. F. Woods, Herbert Norris, Harrison Allen, Charles B. Nancrede, W. J. Grier, Edward J. Nolan, Richard Thomas, Lewis H. Adler, G. B. Dunmire, John Neill, Wharton Sinkler, George Pepper, J. J. Sowerby, Henry C. Eckstein, Eugene P. Bernardy, Charles K. Miles, J. Solis Cohen.

* C. L. Schlatter, J. Wm. White, Daniel Bray, C. E. Cassady, Robert B. Burns, Albert Trenchard, John G. Scott, J. J. Bowen, P. Collings, E. Cullen Brayton, joint committee of the University and Jefferson Medical Colleges.

action of the medical fraternity. The leading journals throughout the country advocated the right of the women to enjoy the advantages of the hospital clinics. *The Press*, November 22, 1869, said:

The proceedings of the meeting held by the faculties of our two leading medical schools evince the disposition which lurks at the bottom of the movement against women as physicians. The hospital managers are to be browbeaten into the stand taken by the students, and now sanctioned by the professors. If the women are to be denied the privilege of clinical lectures, why do not learned professors, or students, or both, have the manliness to suggest and advocate some means of solving the difficulty so that the rights of neither sex shall be impaired? Would any professor agree to lecture to the women separately? Would any professor favor the admission of women into the female wards of the hospitals? Would any professor agree to propose anything, or do anything that would weaken the firm stand taken against the admission of women to professional privileges? If so, why not do it at once? Nothing else will make protestations of fairness appear at all genuine. Nothing else will remove the stigma of attempting to drag the hospitals into a support of this crusade against women. * * * How absurd the solemn declaration, "it cannot be assumed by any right-minded person that male patients should be subjected to inspection before a class of females, although this inspection may, without impropriety, be submitted to before those of their own sex." This cuts both ways. If it be improper for female students to be present when patients of the other sex are treated, is it proper for male students to witness the treatment of female patients?

The practical good sense shown in the following report of a committee of the Faculty of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, makes a very favorable contrast with the unreasonable remonstrances of the so-called superior sex:

PHILADELPHIA, NOV. 15, 1869.

As the relation of students of medicine to public clinics, and the views entertained by those entitled to speak for their medical education, are now extensively discussed in the public journals, it seems necessary for us to state our position. Considering it decided that, as practitioners of medicine, the guardianship of life and health is to be placed in the keeping of women, it becomes the interest of society and the duty of those entrusted with their professional training to endeavor to provide for them all suitable means for that practical instruction which is gained at hospital clinics.

The taunt has heretofore been frequently thrown out that ladies have not attended the great clinical schools of the country, nor listened to its celebrated teachers, and that, consequently, they cannot be as well prepared as men for medical practice. We believe, as we have always done, that in all special diseases of men and women, and in all operations necessarily involving embarrassing exposure of person, it is not fitting or

expedient that students of different sexes should attend promiscuously; that all special diseases of men should be treated by men in the presence of men only, and those of women, where it is practicable, by women in the presence of women only. It was this feeling, founded on the respect due to the delicacy of women as patients, perhaps more than any other consideration, which led to the founding of the Women's Hospital in Philadelphia. There the clinical demonstration of special diseases is made by and before women alone. As we would not permit men to enter these clinics, neither would we be willing—out of regard to the feelings of men as patients, if for no other considerations—that our students should attend clinics where men are specially treated, and there has been no time in the history of our college when our students could intentionally do so, save in direct contravention of our known views. In nearly all the great public hospitals, however, by far the larger proportion of cases suited for clinical illustration—whether medical or surgical—is of those which involve no necessary exposure, and are the results of diseases and accidents to which man and woman are subject alike, and which women are constantly called upon to treat. Into these clinics, women also—often sensitive and shrinking, albeit poor—are brought as patients to illustrate the lectures, and we maintain that wherever it is proper to introduce women as patients, there also is it but just and in accordance with the instincts of the truest womanhood for women to appear as physicians and students.

We had arranged when our class was admitted to the Pennsylvania hospital to attend on alternate clinic days only, so as to allow ample opportunity for the unembarrassed exhibition of special cases to the other students by themselves. We encouraged our students to visit the hospital upon this view, sustained by our confidence in the sound judgment and high-minded courtesy of the medical gentlemen in charge of the wards. All the objections that have been made to our students' admission to these clinics seem to be based upon the mistaken assumption that they had designed to attend them indiscriminately. As we state distinctly and unequivocally that this was not the fact, that they had no idea or intention of being present except on one day of the week, and when no cases which it would not be proper to illustrate before both classes of students would necessarily be brought in—it seems to us that all these objections are destroyed, and we cannot but feel that those fair-minded professional gentlemen, who, under this false impression as to facts, have objected to our course, will, upon a candid reconsideration, acknowledge that our position is just and intrinsically right. The general testimony of those who attended the Saturday clinics last winter at the Philadelphia Hospital at Blockley, when about forty ladies made regular visits, was that the tone and bearing of the students were greatly improved, while the usual cases were brought forward and the full measure of instruction given without any violation of refined propriety.

We maintain, in common with all medical men, that science is impersonal, and that the high aim of relief to suffering humanity sanctifies all duties: and we repel, as derogatory to the science of medicine, the asser

Digitized by Google

tion that the physician who has risen to the level of his high calling need be embarrassed, in treating general diseases, by the presence of earnest women. The movement for woman's medical education has been sustained from the beginning by the most refined, intelligent, and religious women, and by the noblest and best men in the community. It has ever been regarded by these as the cause of humanity, calculated in its very nature to enlarge professional experience, bless women, and refine society. It has in our own city caused a college and a hospital not only to be founded, but to be sustained and endowed by those who have known intimately the character and objects of this work, and the aims and efforts of those connected with it. It has this year brought to this city some fifty educated and earnest women to study medicine, women who have come to this labor enthusiastically but reverently, as to a great life-interest and a holy calling. These ladies purchased tickets, and entered the clinic of the Pennsylvania Hospital, with no obtrusive spirit, and with no intention of interfering with the legitimate advantages of other students. If they have been forced into an unwelcome notoriety, it has not been of their own seeking. ANN PRESTON, M. D., *Dean.*

EMELINE H. CLEVELAND, M. D., *Secretary.*

We are indebted to James Truman, D. D. S., of the Pennsylvania College of Dental Surgery, for the following account of the admission of women into that branch of the medical profession:

The general agitation of the question: What are women best qualified for in the struggle for existence? naturally led liberal minds to the opening of new avenues for the employment of their talents, shared equally with men. Her right to practice in medicine had been conceded after a long and severe conflict. Even the domain of the theologian had been invaded, but law and dentistry were as yet closed, and in the case of the latter, unthought of as an appropriate avocation for women. The subject, however, seemed so important, presenting a field of labor peculiarly suited to her, that one gentleman, then professor in the Pennsylvania College of Dental Surgery, felt It his duty to call public attention to this promising work. In a valedictory delivered by him to the class of 1866, at Musical Fund Hall of Philadelphia, he included in his theme the peculiar fitness of dentistry for women. The question was briefly stated, but it rather startled the large audience by its novelty, and the effect was no less surprising on the faculty, board of trustees and professional gentlemen on the platform.

In the fall of 1868 the dean of the Pennsylvania College of Dental Surgery was waited upon by a German gentleman, who desired to introduce a lady who had come to this country with the expectation that all colleges were open to women. Although informed that this was not the case, he still entertained the hope that she might be admitted as a student of dentistry. She gave her name as Henrietti Hirschfeld, of Berlin. The matter came up before the faculty, and after a free discussion of the whole subject, she was rejected by a majority vote, but two voting in her favor.

In a subsequent interview with Professor Truman, he learned that she had left her native land with the full assurance that she would have no

difficulty in "free America" in securing a dental education. She had also the positive sanction of her government, through the then minister of instruction, Dr. Falk, that on condition of receiving an American diploma she would be permitted to practice on her return. Her distress, therefore, at this initial failure was, naturally, very great. The excitement that this application made was intensified when it was rumored among the students that a woman desired to be matriculated. The opposition became very bitter, and manifested itself in many petty annoyances. In the course of a day or two one gentleman of the faculty, and he the dean, concluded to change his vote, and as this decided the question, she was admitted. The opposition of the professor of anatomy, who belonged to the old school of medical teachers, was so manifest that it was deemed advisable to have her take anatomy in the Woman's Medical College for that winter. The first year of this was in every way satisfactory. Although the students received her and Mrs. Truman, who accompanied her on the first visit, with a storm of hisses, they gradually learned not only to treat her with respect, but she became a favorite with all, and while not convinced as to the propriety of women in dentistry, they all agreed that Mrs. Hirschfeld might do as an exception. The last year she was permitted by the irate professor of anatomy, Dr. Forbes, to take that subject under him.

She graduated with honor, and returned to Berlin to practice her profession. This was regarded as an exceptional case, and by no means settled the status of the college in regard to women. The conservative element was exceedingly bitter, and it was very evident that a long time must elapse before another woman could be admitted. The great stir made by Mrs. Hirschfeld's graduation brought several other applications from ladies of Germany, but these were without hesitation denied. Failing to convince his colleagues of the injustice of their action, Dr. Truman tried to secure more favorable results from other colleges, and applied personally to Dr. Gorgas of the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery. The answer was favorable, and he accompanied the applicant and entered her in that institution. This furnished accommodation for the few applicants. The loss in money began to tell on the pockets, if not the consciences, of the faculty of the Philadelphia school. They saw the stream had flown in another direction, swelling the coffers of another institution, when, without an effort, they could have retained the whole. They concluded to try the experiment again, and accepted three ladies in 1872 and 1873—Miss Annie D. Ramborger of Philadelphia, Fraulein Veleske Wilcke and Dr. Jacoby of Germany. Their first year was very satisfactory, but at its close it was very evident that there was a determination on the part of the minority of the class to spare no effort to effect their removal from the school. A petition was forwarded to the faculty to this effect, and although one was presented by the majority of the students in their favor, the faculty chose to accept the former as representing public sentiment, and it was decided not to allow them to take another year at this college. This outrage was not accomplished without forcible protest from the gentleman previously named, and he appealed from this decision to the gov-

Digitized by Google

erning power, the board of trustees.* To hear this appeal a special meeting was called for March 27, 1873, at which the communication of Professor Truman was read and ordered filed. A similar communication, in opposition, was received, signed by Professors T. L. Buckingham, E. Wildman, George T. Barker, James Tyson and J. Ewing Mears. The matter was referred to a committee consisting of Hon. Henry C. Carey, W. S. Pierce and G. R. Morehouse, M. D. At a special meeting convened for this purpose, March 31, 1873, this committee made their report. They say:

Three ladies entered as students of this college at the commencement of the session, 1872–73, paid their matriculation fees, attended the course of lectures, and were informed, by a resolution adopted by a majority of the faculty at the close of the session, that they would not be permitted to attend the second course of lectures. No other cause was assigned for the action of the faculty than that they deemed it against the interest of the college to permit them to do so, on account of the dissatisfaction which it gave to certain male students, etc. * * * The goal to which all medical and dental students look, is graduation and the diploma, which is to be the evidence of their qualification to practice their art. To qualify themselves for this they bestow their time, their money and their labor. To deprive them of this without just cause is to disappoint their hopes, and to receive from them money and bestowal of time and labor without the full equivalent which they had a right to expect.

After discussing at length the legal aspects of the case, the summing up is as follows:

We, therefore, respectfully report that in our opinion it is the legal right of these ladies to attend, and it is the legal duty of this college to give them, as students, a second course of lectures on the terms of the announcement which forms the basis of the contract with them.

This report was signed by all the committee, and read by W. S. Pierce, one of the number, and judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia. It carried with it, therefore, all the force of a judicial decision, and was so accepted by the board, and adopted at once. This left the majority of the faculty no choice but to accept the decision as final as far as these ladies were concerned. This they did, and the three were invited to resume their studies. Two, Misses Ramborger and Wilcke, accepted, Miss Jacoby refused and went to Baltimore.

The most interesting feature of this matter, and that which clearly demonstrated a marked advance in public opinion, was the stir it made in the press. The daily and Sunday papers bristled with strong leaders, the

* As through the influence of Dr. Truman Miss Hirschfeld had first been admitted to the college, he felt in a measure responsible for the fair treatment of her countrywomen who came to the United States to enjoy the same educational advantages. When the discussion in regard to expelling the young women was pending, Dr. Truman promptly and decidedly told the faculty that if such an act of injustice was permitted he should leave the college also. Much of Dr. Truman's clearsightedness and determination may be traced to the influence of his noble wife and no less noble mother-in-law, Mary Ann McClintock, who helped to inaugurate the movement in 1848 in Central New York. She lamented in her declining years that she was able to do so little. But by way of consolation I often suggested that her influence in many directions could never be measured; and here is one: Her influence on Dr. Truman opened the Dental College to women, and kept it open while Miss Hirschfeld acquired her profession. With her success in Germany, in the royal family, every child in the palace for generations that escapes a toothache will have reason to bless a noble friend, Mary Ann McClintock, that she helped to plant the seeds of justice to woman in the heart of young James Truman. We must also recognize in Dr. Truman's case that he was born and trained in a liberal Quaker family, his own father and mother having been disciples of Elias Hicks.

faculty being denounced in no measured terms for their action. To such an extent was this carried, and so overwhelming was the indignation, that it practically settled the question for Philadelphia, although several years elapsed after these ladies were graduated before others were accepted. When that time did arrive, under the present dean, Dr. C. N. Pierce, they were accorded everything, without any reservation, and the school has continued ever since to accept them. At the meeting of the National Association of Dentists, held at Saratoga, 1869, Dr. Truman introduced a resolution looking to the recognition of women in the profession. The resolution and the remarks were kindly received, but were, of course, laid on the table. This was expected, the object being to make the thought familiar in every section of the country.

These efforts have borne rich fruit, and now women are being educated at a majority of the prominent dental colleges, and no complaints are heard of coëducation in this department of work. The college that first accepted and then rejected—the Pennsylvania of Philadelphia—has a yearly average of seven to eight women, nearly equally divided between America and Germany. Of the three dental schools in Philadelphia, two accept women, and the third—the Dental Department of the University of Pennsylvania—would, if the faculty were not overruled by the governing powers.

The learned theories that were promulgated in regard to the injury the practice of dentistry would be to women, have all fallen to the ground. The advocates of women in dentistry were met at the outstart with the health question, and as it had never been tested, the most favorably inclined looked forward with some anxiety to the result. Fifteen years have elapsed since then, and almost every town in Germany is supplied with a woman in this profession. Many are also established in America. These have all the usual requisites of bodily strength, and the writer has yet to learn of a single failure from physical deterioration.

The first lady, Miss Lucy B. Hobbs, to graduate in dentistry, was sent out from the Cincinnati College, and she, I believe, is still in active practice in Kansas. She graduated in 1866. Mrs. Hirschfeld, before spoken of, returned to Germany and became at once a subject for the fun of the comic papers, and for the more serious work of the *Bajan* and *Überlana und Meer*, both of them containing elaborate and illustrated notices of her. She had some friends in the higher walks of life; notable amongst these was President Lette of the *Trauen-Verein*, whose aid and powerful influence had assisted her materially in the early stages of her effort. The result of these combined forces soon placed her in possession of a large practice. She was patronized by ladies in the highest circles, including the crown princess. She subsequently married, had two boys to rear and educate, and a large household to supervise. She has assisted several of her relatives into professions, two in medicine and two in dentistry, besides aiding many worthy persons. She has established a clinic for women in Berlin, something very badly needed there. This is in charge of two physicians, one being her husband's sister, Dr. Fanny Tiburtius. She has also started a hospital for women.

Digitized by Google

These are mainly supported by her individual exertions. Notwithstanding all these multifarious and trying duties, she practices daily, and is as well physically and mentally as when she commenced. Fraulein Valeske Wilcke of Königsberg has been over twelve years in a very large practice with no evil results; Miss Annie D. Ramborger, an equal time, with an equally large practice, and enjoys apparently far better health than most ladies of thirty.

Dentistry is, probably, one of the most trying professions, very few men being equal to the severe strain, and many are obliged to succumb. No woman has as yet failed, though it would not be at all remarkable if such were the case. The probabilities are that comparatively few will choose it as a profession, but that another door has been opened for employment is a cause for congratulation with all right-thinking minds.

For opening this profession to women a debt of gratitude is due to Dr. Truman from all his countrywomen, as well as to those noble German students, who have so ably filled the positions he secured for them. Similar struggles, both in medicine and dentistry, were encountered in other States, but the result was as it must be in every case, the final triumph of justice for women. Already they are in most of the colleges and hospitals, and members of many of the State and National associations.

In 1870, the Society of Friends founded Swarthmore College * for the education of both sexes, erecting a fine building in a beautiful locality. At the dedication of this institution, Lucretia Mott was elected to honorary membership and invited to the platform. With her own hands she planted the first tree, which now adorns those spacious grounds.

The persecutions that women encountered in every onward step soon taught them the necessity of remodeling the laws and customs for themselves. They began to see the fallacy of the old ideas, that men looked after the interests of women, "that

* PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 10, 1870.—The formal opening of Swarthmore College took place this afternoon, when a large number of its friends were conveyed thither in a special train on the Westchester railroad. The audience assembled in the lecture room, where addresses were delivered by Samuel Willets and John D. Hyoks, of New York, Edward Parrish, president of the college, Wm. Dorsey, and Lucretia Mott. It was stated that the amount spent in land and buildings amounted to $205,000 and contributions were solicited for $100,000 additional to fully furnish the building, and supply a library, philosophical and astronomical apparatus. The building is a massive one of five stories, constructed of Pennsylvania granite, and appointed throughout, from dormitory, bathroom, recitation-hall, to parlor, kitchen and laundry, in the most refined and substantial taste. It is 400 feet in length, by 100 deep, presenting two wings for the dormitories of the male and female students respectively, and a central part devoted to parlor, library, public hall, etc. Especially interesting in this division of the college is a room devoted to Quaker antiquities, comprising portraits and writings of the founders of the sect. Among them we notice the treaty of William Penn, a picture of the treaty assembly, a letter of George Fox, etc. The college opens with 180 pupils, about equally divided between the sexes, the system of instruction being a joint education of boys and girls, though each occupy separate wings of the building. The institution was built by the Hicksite branch of the Society of Friends, but the pupils are not confined to members of that persuasion.

Digitized by Google

they were their natural protectors," that they could safely trust them to legislate on their personal and property rights; for they found in almost every case that whatever right and privilege man claimed for himself, he proposed exactly the opposite for women. Hence the necessity for them to have a voice as to the laws and the rulers under which they lived. Whatever reform they attempted they soon found their labors valueless, because they had no power to remedy any evils protected by law. After laboring in temperance, prison-reform, coëducation, and women's rights in the trades and professions, their hopes all alike centered at last in the suffrage movement.

In 1866, a suffrage association was formed in Philadelphia at a meeting of the American Equal Rights Society,* held in Franklin Institute. This convention was marked by a heated debate on the duty of the abolitionists now that the black man was emancipated, to make the demand for the enfranchisement of women, as well as the freedmen.

We are indebted to John K. Wildman of Philadelphia for the following:

The Pennsylvania association was organized December 22, 1869, in Mercantile Library Hall, Philadelphia. The meeting was called to order by John K. Wildman, who said: "The time has arrived when it is necessary for us to take some action towards promoting the cause of woman suffrage. We desire to do our part as far as practicable, in the work of enlightening the people of our State upon this important subject. With this end in view we propose to organize, hoping that all friends of the movement will cordially give us their influence." Edward M. Davis then proposed the appointment of Judge William S. Pierce as chairman of the meeting. This was agreed to, and Judge Pierce announced that the meeting was ready for business, reserving for another stage of the proceedings any remarks he might wish to make. Annie Heacock was chosen to act as secretary. In accordance with a motion that was adopted, the chairman appointed a committee of five persons† to prepare a constitution, and present the same for the action of the meeting. Mary Grew spoke at length in her earnest and impressive manner, presenting forcibly those familiar yet solid arguments in favor of woman suffrage which form the basis of the discussion, and which should irrevocably settle the question. Dr. Henry T. Child followed with a brief

* The speakers at this convention were Lucretia Mott, Frances Dana Gage, Wendell Phillips, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Edward M. Davis, Robert Purvis, Aaron M. Powell. The officers of the society were: *President*, Robert Purvis; *Vice-presidents*, Lucretia Mott, William Whipper, Dinah Mendenhall; *Recording Secretary*, Mary B. Lightfoot; *Corresponding Secretary*, Frances B. Jackson; *Treasurer*, John K. Wildman; *Executive Committee*, William Still, Ellen M. Child, Harriet Purvis, Elisha Meaner, Octavius Catts, Sarah S. Hawkins, Sarah Pugh, Clementina Johns, Alfred H. Love, Louisa J. Roberts, Jay Chapel.

† J. K. Wildman, Miss A. Ramborger, Clementina L. John, Ellen M. Child, and Passmore Williamson.

address, showing his zealous interest in the object of the meeting, and trusting that at no distant period the ballot would be placed in the hands of the women of the land. Judge Pierce said:

I am in favor of giving woman a chance in the world. I feel very much in regard to woman as Diogenes did when Alexander the Great went to see him. When the monarch arrived at the city in which Diogenes lived, he sent a request for him to come to see him. Diogenes declined to go. The monarch then went to the place of his residence, and found him lying in his court-yard sunning himself. He did not even rise when Alexander approached. Standing over him, the warrior asked, "Diogenes, what can I do for you?" And the philosopher answered, "Nothing, except to stand out of my sunshine." Now, I am disposed to stand out of woman's sunshine. If she wants the light of the sun upon her, and the breath of heaven upon her, and freedom of action necessary to develop herself, heaven forbid that I should stand in her way. I believe that everything goes to its own place in God's world, and woman will go to her place if you do not impede her. We should not be afraid to trust her, or to apply the same principles to her in regard to suffrage that we apply to ourselves. There should be no distinction. Her claims to the ballot rest upon a just and logical foundation.

The venerable Sojourner Truth spoke a few words of encouragement, showing in her humble and fervid way a reverent faith in the final triumph of justice. After the adoption of the constitution, the organization was completed by the election of officers * to serve for the ensuing year.

The first thing that claimed the attention of the officers of the new society was the representation of the different counties on the executive committee; and for this purpose the chairman wrote to nearly all of the sixty-three counties, chiefly to the postmasters of the principal towns. The replies that were received presented a curious medley of sentiment and opinion touching the object in view, disclosing every shade of tone and temper between the two extremes of cold indifference and warm enthusiasm. It was evident that, in a large number of cases, the inquiries promptly found their resting-place in the waste-basket. Before the close of the year twenty-two counties were represented. Thus reinforced, the committee took immediate steps towards distributing documents and circulating petitions throughout the State. Many of the county members coöperated earnestly in this work. Some of them, not satisfied to limit their action to this particular form of service, aided the movement by collecting funds and holding public meetings in their respective localities. Matilda Hindman, representing Alleghany county, evinced both energy and enterprise in forwarding the movement through the agency of public meetings. She did good service from the beginning, relying almost solely upon her own determined purpose. Her deep interest in the work and its object, and the courage that animated her at the first impulse of duty, have continued without abatement to the present time. Her usefulness and activity have not confined themselves within the limits of Pennsylvania, but have extended to other States, both in the East and West.

---

* *President*, Mary Grew; *Vice-Presidents*, Edward M. Davis, Mrs. C. A. Farrington, Mary K. Williamson; *Recording Secretary*, Annie Heacock; *Corresponding Secretary*, Eliza Sproat Turner; *Treasurer*, Gulielma M. S. P. Jones; *Executive Committee*, John K. Wildman, Ellen M. Child, Annie Shoemaker, Charlotte L. Pierce, and Dr. Henry T. Child.

Digitized by Google

Miss Matilda Hindman, of Philadelphia, pays the following tribute to her parents:

In 1837, my father being a member of the school committee of the Union township, Washington county, secured equal salaries for women; and in spite of steady opposition, there was no difference made for four years. The women who taught the schools in the summer were paid the same as the men who taught in the winter. At the death of my father the board returned to the old system of half pay for women; the result was "incompetent teachers," furnishing the opposition with just the plea they desired—that women were not fit for school teachers. My mother remonstrated, but in vain. They replied, "women never received as much as men for any work"; "it did not cost as much to keep a woman as a man," and moreover, these school matters belonged to men, and women had no right to interfere. In 1842, my mother offered to board the teacher in her district, gratis, if the board would raise her salary proportionally. They received her proposition with scorn. She then refused to pay her taxes. Such was the respect for her in the community, and the sense of justice in regard to the teachers, that the authorities suffered the tax to go unpaid, and at the end of the year accepted the proposition, and for many years after, she boarded the teacher in her district, making the woman's net salary equal to that of the man.

My mother lived to see her daughters employed in her township on equal salaries with men. But in process of time, another board, for the express purpose of humiliating mother and daughters alike, passed a resolution to take two dollars a month from each of their salaries, when all three resigned. They all honored her, by carrying into their life-work the noble principles for which she suffered so much.

She was the grand-daughter of a Scotch-Irish Presbyterian minister, who, with his young family, was among the earliest settlers in the wilderness of what is now known as the prosperous and beautiful county of Washington, Pennsylvania. Her name was Sarah Campbell. She was born in 1798. From her earliest girlhood she rebelled against the injustice done women by the law. She felt acutely the wrong done her and her sisters by being denied an education equal to their brothers, and denied also an equal share of their inheritance. While the father possessed a large estate, and provided liberally for his sons, he left his daughters a mere pittance.

In view of such facts, it is folly to say that women were ever satisfied with the humiliating discriminations of sex they have endured in all periods, and in all ranks in society.

The first annual report of the association was prepared by Eliza Sproat Turner. She said:

We do not complain that man is slow to realize the injustice of his present attitude towards woman—an attitude once, from necessity, endurable; now, from too long continuance, grown intolerable. It would not be natural for him to feel it with equal keenness. It takes a great-minded fox to find out, what every goose knows, that foxes' teeth are cruel. And while we do not complain of this incapacity on his part, the advocates of this cause feel the necessity for woman to take upon herself whatever share in the management of their mutual affairs shall be needed to right the balance; concluding that the defects in legislation which she is, by reason of her position, more competent to understand, she should be more competent to remedy. Not these innovations alone, but others involving matters beyond individual interests, she expects to achieve by the power she shall gain through the exercise of her right of suffrage. We discern, in the consideration of nearly all questions of national welfare, a disposition to press unduly the interests of trade and commerce rather than the interests of the fireside.

Mary Grew presided, and has been elected president of the association every year from the beginning, performing the duties of the position with ability, earnestness and satisfaction. In the winter of 1870–71 the execu-

Digitized by Google

tive committee recommended the passage of a law that should give married women the control of their own earnings. The appeal to the legislature in behalf of such a law was renewed the following winter, and its passage finally secured. Among the resolutions adopted at the annual meeting was the following:

Resolved, That the vote of the legislature of this State for a convention to amend the constitution, makes it our duty to work for the exclusion of the word "male" from the provision defining the qualifications for the elective franchise, and that we call upon all friends of justice to give their best energies to the sustaining of this object.

Subsequently the executive committee prepared a petition with reference to the formation of the constitutional convention, asking the legislature, in making the needful regulations, to frame them in such a way as to secure the representation of the women of the State. This petition was unavailing. At the next annual meeting, which was held at the time the constitutional convention was in session, a resolution was adopted containing an appeal to that body, earnestly requesting it to present to the people of the State a constitution that should secure the right of suffrage to its citizens without distinction of sex, accompanied by a request for a hearing at such time and place as the convention should decide. The request was willingly granted, and an evening assigned for that purpose. An evening was also given to the Citizens' Suffrage Society of Philadelphia for a like object. These meetings were held in the hall of the convention, and were largely attended by the members and by the people generally. Addresses were delivered by various friends of woman suffrage, as representatives of the two societies.* Still another evening was granted the Pennsylvania association for a meeting to be addressed by Bishop Matthew Simpson of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The earnest and forcible words of the eloquent speaker, and his solid array of arguments, made a deep impression on the attentive audience.

In the convention the question was discussed during five successive days. Hon. John M. Broomall introduced a provision in favor of making the ballot free to men and women alike, proposing that it be incorporated in the new constitution. This provision was ably advocated by Mr. Broomall and many other members of the convention. Their firm convictions in behalf of equal and exact justice, however well sustained by sound reasoning and earnest appeal, was an unequal match for the rooted conservatism which recoiled from such a new departure. Although the measure was defeated, its discussion had an influence. It was animated, intelligent and exhaustive, and drew public attention more directly to the subject than anything that had occurred since the beginning of its agitation in the State.

The only act of the convention that gave hope to the friends of impartial suffrage was the adoption of the third section of Article X.: "Women twenty-one years of age and upwards shall be eligible to any office of control or management under the school laws of this State." It was a

* Among those who addressed the members of the convention were Bishop Matthew Simpson, Rev. Charles G. Ames, Fanny B. Ames, Mary Grew, Sarah C. Hallowell, Matilda Hindman, Elizabeth S. Bladen and Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

Digitized by Google

very faint gleam of comfort, too small to stir more than a breath of praise. It had the merit of being a step in the right direction, though timid and feeble, and as it has never disturbed the equilibrium of society, it may ultimately be followed by others of more importance.

The annual meetings of the association have been held in Philadelphia, Westchester, Bristol, Kennett Square and Media, respectively. An interesting feature of the Westchester meeting was the reading of an essay, entitled "Four quite New Reasons why you should wish your Wife to Vote." It was written for the occasion by Eliza Sproat Turner, and was subsequently printed and re-printed in tract form by order of the executive committee, and freely circulated among the people. It was likewise published in the *Woman's Journal.* Other documents relative to the question have been printed from time to time by authority of the committee, and large numbers of suffrage tracts have been purchased for distribution year after year, embodying the best thoughts, the soundest arguments, and the most forcible reasoning that the question has elicited. Frequent petitions have been sent to the legislature and to congress, all having in view the one paramount object, and showing by their repeated and persistent appearance the indefatigable nature of a living, breathing reform. The executive committee at one time employed Matilda Hindman as State agent. Meetings were held by her chiefly in the western part of the State. In 1874 her services extended to the State of Michigan, where the question of woman suffrage was specially before the people. Lelia E. Patridge also represented the association in Michigan at that time, where she performed excellent service in addressing numerous meetings in different parts of the State. In 1877 Miss Patridge was appointed to represent the society in Colorado. There she labored with others to secure the adoption of a constitutional amendment providing for suffrage without regard to sex. On several occasions the executive committee has contributed to woman suffrage purposes in other States. Massachusetts, Michigan, Colorado and Oregon have been recipients of the limited resources of the association. The executive committee has felt the cramping influence of an unfriended treasury. Its provision has been the fruit of unwearied soliciting, and should the especial object of the association ever be accomplished, the honors of success may be fitly contested by the fine art of begging.

The following report was sent us by Mrs. Mary Byrnes:

March 22, 1872, the Citizens' Suffrage Association of Philadelphia was formed, William Morris Davis, president, with fifty members. The name of the society was chosen to denote the view of its members as to the basis of the elective franchise. The amendments to the United States constitution had clearly defined who were citizens, and shown citizenship to be without sex. Woman was as indisputably a citizen as man. Whatever rights he possessed as a citizen she possessed also. The supreme law of the land placed her on the same plane of political rights with him. If man held the right of suffrage as a citizen of the United States, either by birthright within the respective States, or by naturalization under the United States, then the right of the female citi-

Digitized by Google

zen to vote was as absolute as that of the male citizen; and woman's disfranchisement became a wrong inflicted upon her by usurped power. Men became voters by reason of their citizenship, having first complied with certain police regulations imposed within and by the respective States. The Citizens' Suffrage Association demanded the same political rights for all citizens, nothing more, nothing less. It repudiated the idea that one class of citizens should ask of another class rights which that other class never possessed, and which those who were denied them never had lost. This society held that the right to give implied the right to take away; and further, that the right to give implied a right lodged somewhere in society, which society had never acquired by any direct concession from the people.

This society held also, that the theory of the right to the franchise, as a gift, bore with it the power somewhere to restrict the male citizen's suffrage, and to strike at the principle of self-government. They had seen this doctrine earnestly advanced. They knew that there was a growing class in the country who were inimical to universal suffrage. In view of this they chose the name of citizen suffrage, as the highest and broadest term by which to designate their devotion to the political rights of all citizens. They held that the political condition of the white women of the United States was totally unlike that of the slave population in this: that while the slaves were not considered citizens until the adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, white women had always been citizens, and always entitled to all the political rights of citizenship. The colored male citizen became a voter—subject to the police regulations of the different States—upon acquiring citizenship. No constitutional enactment denied equal political rights to women as citizens. No constitutional enactment was therefore required to enable them to exercise the right to vote, which became the right of male slaves upon their securing citizenship under the law. The first legal argument on the subject of woman's right to the ballot as a citizen of the United States, was made by Jacob F. Byrnes before the Pennsylvania Society. Had it been published as soon as written, instead of being circulated privately, surprising person after person with the position taken, it would have antedated the report of General Benjamin F. Butler in the House of Representatives in the winter of 1871.

Edward M. Davis, president for many years, was one of the most active and untiring officers of this association, giving generously of his time and money not only to its support but to the general agitation of the suffrage question in every part of the country. The meetings were held regularly at his office, 333 Walnut street, as were also those of the Radical Club. This was composed largely of the same members as the suffrage society, but in this organization they had a greater latitude in discussion, covering all questions of political, religious and social interest. As the division in the National Society produced divi-

sion everywhere, some of the friends in Philadelphia made themselves auxiliary to the American Association, and the sympathy of others was with the National, thus forming two rival societies, which together kept the suffrage question before the people and roused their attention, particularly to the fact of a pending constitutional convention. Hence the necessity of holding meetings throughout the State, and rolling up petitions asking that the constitution be so amended as to secure to women the right to vote. The following appeal was issued by this association:

To the Editor of the Post:

SIR: There is no political question now before the people of this commonwealth more important than the consideration of the changes to be made in our constitution. The citizens of the State, by an enormous majority of votes, have re-claimed the sovereign powers of government, and evinced a determination to re-form the fundamental law, the constitution of this State, in the interest of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." In this new adaptation of old rules of government to the advanced ideas of the age, it seems to us fitting and opportune that woman in her new status as a citizen of the United States (under the fourteenth amendment of the constitution), should be allowed the exercise of rights which have been withheld under old rules of action. Therefore we respectfully ask you to give this, with our appeal, an insertion in your paper, and to continue the appeal until further notice. And we ask all the friends of woman suffrage to aid our association in placing this appeal in each paper of our city, as well as of the neighboring towns.

"There is no distinction in citizenship as has been determined by the fourteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States. The citizens of Pennsylvania have decided on a revision of the constitution of the commonwealth. The power of revision is to be delegated by the citizens of the commonwealth to a convention. The foundation of free government is based on the consent of the governed. Therefore, the Citizens' Suffrage Association of Pennsylvania appeals to the sense of right and justice in the hearts of the citizens of this State, to aid in securing to every citizen, irrespective of sex, an equal voice in the selection of delegates, and an equal right, if elected thereto, to a seat in said constitutional convention."

WM. MORRIS DAVIS, *Controller.*

Mr. Robert Purvis, at the request of the Citizens' Suffrage Association of Philadelphia, waited upon Mrs. President Hayes and presented to her an address adopted by that society. Mr. Purvis wrote:

I have just returned from a very satisfactory and delightful interview with Mrs. Hayes. She received me most cordially. I read to her the eloquent address from the Citizens' Suffrage Association. She listened with marked attention, was grateful for the high favor conferred upon her, and sent her best wishes for the success of the cause. I made reference to the fact that the address bore the honored name of Lucretia Mott, which she received with a ready acknowledgment of her great worth and usefulness, and her distinguished place as a reformer and philanthropist.

Through the liberality of Edward M. Davis, this society was able to publish and circulate an immense number of tracts covering all phases of the question. He has been one of the few

abolitionists who have thrown into this movement all the old-time fervor manifested in the slavery conflict. A worthy son of the sainted Lucretia Mott, her mantle seems to have fallen on his shoulders.

The Hon. John M. Broomall was ever ready to champion the cause of equality of rights for women, not only in the legislature and in the constitutional conventions of his own State, but on the floor of congress as well. In a letter giving us valuable information on several points, he says:

You ask when I made my first declaration for woman suffrage. I cannot tell. I was born in 1816, and one of the earliest settled convictions I formed as a man was that no person should be discriminated against on account of sect, sex, race or color, but that all should have an equal chance in the race which the Divine Ruler has set before all; and I never missed an opportunity to give utterance to this conviction in conversation, on the stump, on the platform and in legislative bodies. My views were set out concisely in my remarks in congress, on January 30, 1869, and I cite the commencement and conclusion, as I find them in *The Globe* of that date:

Every person owing allegiance to the government and not under the legal control of another, should have an equal voice in making and administering the laws, unless debarred for violating those laws; and in this I make no distinction of wealth, intelligence, race, family or sex. If just government is founded upon the consent of the governed, and if the established mode of consent is through the ballot-box, then those who are denied the right of suffrage can in no sense be held as consenting, and the government which withholds that right is as to those from whom it is withheld no just government. * * * * The measure now before the House is necessary to the complete fulfillment of what has gone before it. To hesitate now is to put in peril all we have gained. Let this, too, pass into history as an accomplished fact. Let it be followed, in due course of time, by the last crowning act of the series—an amendment to the constitution securing to all citizens of full age, without regard to sex, an equal voice in making and amending the laws under which they live, to be forfeited only for crime. Then the great mission of the party in power will be fulfilled; then will have been demonstrated the capacity of man for self-government; then a just nation, founded upon the full and free consent of its citizens will be no longer a dream of the optimist.

Mrs. Virginia Barnhurst writes:

I think you should make mention of the few men who, against the greatest opposition, stood boldly up and avowed themselves in favor of woman's cause. When I think of some of the speeches that I heard from the opposite side—expressions which sent the hot blood to my face, and which showed the low estimate law-makers put upon woman, those few men who dared to defend mothers and sisters, stand out in my mind as worthy of having their names go down in history—and especially in a history written by women. I had a good talk with Lawyer Campbell. He is one of the most ardent in the cause; he believes the ballot to be a necessity to woman, as a means of self-protection, this necessity being seen in the unequal operation of many laws relating to the guardianship

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

Rachel G. Foster.

Digitized by Google

[illegible]

[illegible] petitions for those and full suffr[illegible] the entire [illegible] of the convent[illegible] [illegible] presented the minority [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] ast at said election should be in the affirmative [illegible] [illegible] the restrictions placed [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] for full suffrage was lost by a vote of [illegible] to 25, [illegible] while the amendment making women eligible for [illegible] was carried by a vote of 60 to 32.* The debate by [illegible] of the amendment was so ably and eloquently con[illegible] would gladly reproduce it, had not all the salient [illegible] so often and so exhaustively presented on the floor [illegible] and by some of the members from Pennsylvania.

[illegible] passage of the school law of 1873, it was immediately [illegible] the State, rousing opposition and conflict every[illegible] the struggle resulted favorably to women, who now [illegible] offices to which they were once ineligible. At the [illegible] school directors in Philadelphia, the nomination

[illegible] men who spoke for woman's enfranchisement were John M. Broomall, John M. Camp[illegible] [illegible] Palmer, William [illegible] Frank M[illegible] [illegible] Henry [illegible] Thomas [illegible] Cochran [illegible] who spoke, those who voted [illegible] are John E. Addicks, William H. Ainey, William [illegible] George [illegible] Matthew Edwards [illegible] Howard [illegible] George [illegible] H. W. Patter[illegible]

Digitized by Google

of children and the ownership of property. Caleb White's words have in them the just consciousness of their own immortality: "I want my vote to be recorded; not to be judged of here, but to be judged of by coming generations, who, at least, will give to woman the rights which God intended she should have."

The constitutional convention to which reference has been so frequently made in this chapter, assembled November 12, 1872, and as early as the 22d, resolutions relative to women holding school-offices and to the property-rights of women were presented. Numberless petitions for these and full suffrage for women were sent in during the entire sitting of the convention. February 3, 1873, John H. Campbell presented the minority report of the Committee on Suffrage and Elections:

The undersigned, members of the Committee on Suffrage, Election and Representation, dissent from that part of the majority report of said committee, which limits the right of suffrage to male electors. We recommend that the question, "Shall woman exercise the right of suffrage," be submitted by the convention to the qualified electors of this commonwealth, and also upon the same day therewith, to those women of the commonwealth who upon the day of voting shall be of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, and have been residents of the State one year, and in the district where they offered to vote at least sixty days prior thereto; and that if the majority of all the votes cast at said election should be in the affirmative, then the word "male" as a qualification for an elector, contained in section ——, article —— on suffrage and election shall be stricken out, and women in this State shall thereafter exercise the right of suffrage, subject only to the restrictions placed upon the male voters.

JOHN H. CAMPBELL,
LEWIS C. CASSIDY.
LEVI ROOKE.

The amendment for full suffrage was lost by a vote of 75 to 25, with 33 absent, while the amendment making women elegible for school offices was carried by a vote of 60 to 32.* The debate by those in favor of the amendment was so ably and eloquently conducted that we would gladly reproduce it, had not all the salient points been so often and so exhaustively presented on the floor of congress, and by some of the members from Pennsylvania.

After the passage of the school law of 1873, it was immediately tested all over the State, rousing opposition and conflict everywhere, but the struggle resulted favorably to women, who now hold many offices to which they were once ineligible. At the first election of school directors in Philadelphia the nomination

* Among the men who spoke for woman's enfrancisement were John M. Broomall, John M. Campbell, Lewis C. Cassidy, Benjamin L. Temple, Levi Rooke, George F. Horton, H. W. Palmer, William Darlington, Harry White, Frank Mantor, Thomas MacConnell, Henry Carter, Thomas E. Cochran. In addition to those who spoke, those who voted *yes* are John E. Addicks, William H. Ainey, William D. Baker, Charles O. Bowman, Charles Brodhead, George N. Corson, David Craig, Matthew Edwards, J. Gillingham Tell, Thomas Howard, Edward C. Knight, George Lear, John S. Mann, H. W. Patterson, T. H. B. Patton, Thomas Struthers, John W. F. White.

Digitized by Google

of two women was hotly contested. The *Evening Telegraph* of February 6, 1874, gives the following:

There is progressing in the Thirteenth ward a contest which involves so peculiar and important an issue as to merit the widest publicity. It illustrates how the rights guaranteed to women under the new constitution are to be denied them, if cunning and bold chicanery are to be tolerated, by a few ward politicians. At the Republican primary election, held January 20, Mrs. Harriet W. Paist and Mrs. George W. Woelpper were duly nominated as candidates for members of the board of school directors of the ward. Both of these ladies received their certificates, that given to Mrs. Paist reading as follows:

This is to certify that at a meeting of the judges of the different divisions of the Thirteenth ward, held in accordance with the rules of the Republican party, on the evening of January 20, 1874, Mrs. Harriet W. Paist was found to be elected as candidate upon the Republican ticket from the Thirteenth ward, for school director.

JAMES M. STEWART, } *Clerks.* CHARLES M. CARPENTER, *President.*
DAVID J. SMITH, }

No sooner was it ascertained that the ladies had actually become candidates on the Republican ticket than a movement was inaugurated to oust them, the old war tocsin of "Anything to beat Grant" being for this purpose amended thus: "Anything to beat the women." This antagonism to the fair candidates was based entirely upon the supposition that their names would so materially weaken the ticket as to place the election of the Republican common councilman, Henry C. Dunlap, in the greatest jeopardy. To save him, therefore, the managers of the movement must sacrifice Mesdames Woelpper and Paist. How was this to be accomplished? Each was fortified in her position by a genuine certificate of election, and had, furthermore, expressed her determination to run. What could not be done fairly must be accomplished by strategy. Mr. Ezra Lukens called upon Mrs. Paist, stating that if she did not withdraw the Republicans who were opposed to the lady candidates would unite with the "other party" and defeat the Republican ward ticket. Mrs. Paist inquired if she had not been regularly nominated, and his reply was that she had been, but that her opponents in the party would unite with the "other party" and defeat her. Mrs. Paist was firm, and Mr. Lukens retired foiled. A day or two after, the chairman of the Thirteenth ward Republican executive committee received somehow this letter:

PHILADELPHIA, February 2, 1874.

DEAR SIR: Please accept this as my declination as school director on the Thirteenth ward Republican ticket. Hoping it will please those opposed to a lady director.

Respectfully yours, HARRIET W. PAIST.

A week previous to this the husband of Mrs. Woelpper was called upon by Mr. William B. Elliott, a member of this executive committee, and was informed by him that Mrs. Paist had withdrawn, and that it would be unpleasant, if not inexpedient, for Mrs. Woelpper to run alone. Mr. Woelpper expressed his belief that if such were the case his wife would withdraw. At a meeting of the executive committee a short time after, it was announced that both the ladies had withdrawn, and everything looked serene for victory, when the next day the members were individually informed that the letter of declination written above was a base forgery, and that neither of the ladies intended to withdraw from the contest. Another meeting of the executive committee was held on the 2d inst., at which Mr. Woelpper, jr., was present. He declared that the statement made to his father was false, and that he was present to say for his mother that she was still a candidate. This announcement fell like a bomb in a peaceful camp, causing great confusion. After order was restored, William B. Elliott, the collector, offered a resolution declaring it inexpedient to have any ladies on the ticket at this time. This resolution was opposed by F. Theodore Walton and a number of the members, who denied the power of the committee to change the ticket regularly chosen at the primary election. They favored the fair candidates, for whose election as school directors the constitution had made special provisions, and whose

presence in the school-boards had been very favorably commented upon by all the papers of the city. Besides, the ladies were as legitimately entitled to their candidacy as Mr. Dunlap, and it would be a gross and unparalelled outrage to sacrifice them from mere prejudice, or in the belief that their presence would injure the chances of Mr. Dunlap. Then arose Collector Elliott, his face fairly glowing with honest indignation, and his voice sharp and stinging in his tirade against the newspapers. What did he care what the newspapers said? What are the newspapers but sheets sold out to the highest bidder? The newspapers, he cried, are all in the market, to be bought and sold the same as coal! That was their business, and they didn't want stability so long as there was cash to be got. Then he came down upon them in a perfect whirlwind of wrath for daring to favor the women candidates for school directors of the Thirteenth ward, and sat down as though he had accomplished a noble purpose.

The question on the resolution was pressed, and resulted in its adoption by a vote of 20 to 12.* A resolution was offered by David T. Smith that Mrs. Paist and Mrs. Woelpper be thrown off the ticket, and this resolution was carried by the same vote as the preceding one. The meeting then adjourned. In consequence of this action Mrs. Paist addressed to the citizens of the Thirteenth ward the following card, in which she declares that she does not intend to resign:

To the Citizens of the Thirteenth Ward:

Unpleasant though it may be to thus appear before the public, I feel that I must, in justice to myself, expose the fraud and deception that have been practiced to defeat my election on the 17th of February next. I received the nomination and certificate of election signed by James M. Stewart, David T. Smith, clerks, and Charles M. Carpenter, president. Certainly they would not be guilty of deceiving, for are they not "all honorable men"? John B. Green, George M. Taylor and A. W. Lyman then (Ezra Lukens having been on a similar fruitless mission) called on the eve of January 30, 1874, wishing me to withdraw; stating that Mrs. Woelpper had done so (which was false), and they thought it would not be pleasant for me to serve. They also placed it on the ground of expediency, fearing that their candidate for council (Mr. Dunlap) was so weak that a woman on the ticket might jeopardize the election. I knew not before that woman held the balance of power. After sending their emissaries under the false garb of friendship to induce me to decline, without success, they were reduced to the desperate means of producing a letter, which was read by the secretary of the executive meeting, February 2, purporting to come from me, and withdrawing my name. I pronounce it publicly to be a forgery. I have not withdrawn, neither do I intend to withdraw. Would that I had the power of Brutus or a Patrick Henry, that I might put these designing, intriguing politicians in their true light! They deserve to be held up to the contumely and scorn of the community.

February 3, 1874. HARRIET W. PAIST.

Despite the action of the committee, these talented ladies will be run as the regular candidates for school directors. A committee of citizens of the Republican party will prepare the tickets and see that they are properly distributed, and take all precautions against fraud at the election and against any effort that may be made to count out the fair candidates at the meeting of the ward return judges. It is of the greatest importance that all good citizens of the ward shall do all in their power to secure not only the fullest possible number of votes for the lady candidates, but a fair count when

* *Ayes*—William Styles, William McLain, clerks in the water department; A. W. Lyman, clerk in the custom-house; M. C. Coppeck, clerk in the highway department, who was defeated by one of the ladies for school directorship; John B. Green, a member of the board of education; John Buckley, clerk in the post-office; Theodore Canfield, sergeant of police; John Murray, contractor of the highway department; George W. Schrack, an ex-clerk, lately resigned from the tax receiver's office; Daniel T. Smith, ex-detective; Asher W. Dewees, Oliver Bowler, Mr. Agnew, Ezra Lukens, clerk in the United States assistant treasurer's office, president of the Republican Invincibles, candidate last year against Mr. Jonathan Pugh for commissioner of city property, and a candidate for the same office next year; William B. Elliott, collector of internal revenue; Charles M. Carpenter, alderman, who signed Mrs. Paist's certificate; Jackson Keyser, an employé in the navy yard; Alfred Ruhl, clerk in the custom-house; Mr. Jones, and Henry C. Dunlap, who is Republican candidate for common council—20. *Nays*—James W. Sayre, Joseph B. Ridge, Samuel Caldwell, Dr. Charles Hooker, John E. Lane, Lewis Bogy, John Mansfield, Daniel Rieff, William Githens, Thomas Evans, George Schimpf and F. Theodore Walton—12. So the resolution was carried by 20 yeas to 12 nays.

they have been received. It remains to be seen whether the Republican citizens of the ward will endorse the action of a committee which from mere prejudice can throw off regularly-elected candidates from a ticket.

The ladies were elected, and Mrs. Paist served her term. Mrs. Woelpper died immediately after the election.

Anna McDowell, in the *Sunday Repnblic* of April 8, 1877, in a long article shows the necessity of some legal knowledge for women, enough at least to look after their own interests, and not be compelled through their ignorance to trust absolutely to the protection of others. They should be trained to understand that all pecuniary affairs should be placed on a business basis as strictly between themselves and their fathers and brothers as men require in their contracts with each other. After giving many instances in which women have been grossly defrauded by their relatives, she points to the will of the great railroad king of Pennsylvania:

Let us glance for a moment at the will of the late J. Edgar Thomson, than which no more unjust testament was ever offered for probate. This gentleman, the sole object of affection of two most worthy and self-sacrificing sisters, married late in life without making any adequate settlement upon the relatives to whom, in a great measure, he owed his success. He always promised to provide for them amply, saying, repeatedly, in effect, in letters which we have seen, "As my fortune advances so also shall yours; my prosperity will be your prosperity," etc. Oblivious to the ties of nature and affection, however, when he came to make his will he, out of a fortune of two millions, bequeathed to these sisters, during life, an annuity of $1,200 per annum only, leaving the rest of the income of his estate to his wife and her niece, the latter a young lady whom he had previously made independent by his skilful investment of a few thousand dollars left her by her father. Not content with the will which gave her also a large income for life out of Mr. Thomson's estate, this niece of his wife brought suit against the executors to recover bonds found after the death of the testator in an envelope on which her name was written, and through the ruling of Judge Thayer, a relation by marriage to the husband of the lady, the case was decided in her favor, and $100,000 was thus absolutely and permanently taken from the fund designed for the asylum which it was Mr. Thomson's long-cherished desire to found for the benefit and education of orphan girls whose fathers had been or might be killed by accident on the Pennsylvania and other railroads. The injustice of this decision is made manifest when we reflect that the Misses Anna and Adeline Thomson, who worked side by side with their brother as civil engineers in their father's office, and labored, without pay, therein, that he might be educated and sent abroad further to perfect himself in his profession, were cut off with a comparatively paltry stipend for life, this being still further reduced by the collateral-inheritance tax. As high an authority as Dr. William A. Hammond says that, "for a man to cut off his natural heirs in his will is *prima facie* evidence of abberation of mind," and we believe this to be true.

Had these sisters* been brothers they would have been recognized as partners and had their legal proportion of the accumula-

* Their modest home at 114 North Eleventh street has long been a hospitable retreat for reformers, where many of us identified with the suffrage movement have been most courteously entertained. Anna and Adeline Thomson after long lives of industry have been, too, the stendfast representatives of great principles in religious and political freedom, always giving freely of their means to the unpopular reforms of their day and generation.—[E. C. S.

tions of the business in which they labored in early years with equal faithfulness, side by side. This is but another instance of women's blind faith in the men of their families and of the danger in allowing business matters to adjust themselves on the basis of honor, courtesy and protection.

Among the literary women of the State are Sarah C. Hallowell, on the editorial staff of the *Public Ledger;* the daughters of John W. Forney, for many years in charge of the woman's department of *Forney's Progress;* Anne McDowell, editor of the woman's department in *The Sunday Republic;* Mrs. E. A. Wade; "Bessie Bramble" of Pittsburg has for many years ably edited a woman's department in the *Sunday Leader;* Matilda Hindman, an excellent column in the *Pittsburg Commercial Gazette.* In science Grace Anna Lewis stands foremost. Her paper read before the Woman's Congress in Philadelphia in 1876, attracted much attention. These ladies with others organized "The Century Club"* in 1876, for preëminently practical and benevolent work. Its objects are various: looking after working girls, sending children into the country for fresh air during summer, and improving the houses of the poor and needy. The Club has a large house to which is attached a cooking-school and lodgings for unfortunates in great emergencies.

Woman's ambition was not confined at this period to literature and the learned professions; she found herself capable of practical work on a large scale in the department of agriculture. The *Philadelphia Press* has the following:

The beautiful farm of Abel C. Thomas, at Tacony, near Philadelphia, is remarkable chiefly because it is managed by a woman, Mrs. Louise H. Thomas. Her husband, the intimate friend of Horace Greeley, and well known as an author and theologian, in time past, has long been too feeble to take any part in managing the property. That duty has devolved upon Mrs. Thomas. The house, two hundred yards from the Pennsylvania railroad, is hidden from view by the trees which surround it. The grounds are tastefully laid out, and the lawn mowed with a regularity that indicates constant feminine attention. The plot is 20 acres in extent. Six acres comprise the orchard and garden. In addition to apple, apricot, pear, peach, plum and cherry, there are specimens of all kinds of trees, from pine to poplar.

---

* The Executive Board of the New Century Club for 1879–1880, was: *President*, Mrs. Eliza S. Turner; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. Emily W. Taylor, Mrs. S. C. F. Hallowell, Mrs. Henry C. Townsend, Mrs. Aubrey H. Smith; *Corresponding Secretary*, Miss Louise Stockton; *Recording Secretary*, Miss Anna C. Bliss; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Charlotte L. Pierce; *Directors*, Mrs. Susan I. Lesley, Mrs. Henry Cohen, Mrs. Huldah Justice, Miss Emily Sartain, Miss Mary Grew, Mrs. S. B. F. Greble, Mrs. M. W. Coggins, Miss Mary A. Burnham, Mrs. Elliston L. Perot, Mrs. Thomas Roberts. Other names found in its annual report as contributing to the efficiency of the club are: Mrs. Fannie B. Ames, Miss Grace Anna Lewis, Mrs. Emma J. Bartol, Mrs. E. L. Head, Miss Mary C Coxe, Mrs. Charlotte L. Pierce, Madam Emma Seiler, Miss Amanda L. Dods, Miss Lelia Patridge, Miss Lily Ray, Miss Ella Cole, Mrs. Susan I. Lesley, Mrs. E. C. Mayer. Miss Bennett, Mlle. Frasson. The work of the club has its divisions of science, literature, art, music, entertainment, cooking, hospitalities, charities, employment for women, legal protection for working women, prisons and reformatory institutions.

Digitized by Google

A *Press* reporter recently walked over the premises, and Mrs. Thomas explained her manner of doing business. "I look after everything about the farm; take my little sample bags of wheat to the mills, and sell the crop by it; and twice I got ten cents more a bushel than any of my neighbors. But the things I take most interest in are my cows, chickens and bees. My cattle are from Jersey island, and pure Alderney. They are very gentle and good milkers. From four of them I get about 800 pounds of butter a year. The price of this butter varies from 50 cents to $1.00 per pound. There's my dog. When it's milking time, the hired man says to the dog, 'Shep, go after the cows,' and away he goes, and in a little while the herd come tinkling up. Why send a man to do a boy's work, or a boy to do that which a shepherd dog can do just as well? The cows understand him, and readily come when they are sent after. Well, so much for the milk department. Now, as to the garden; I don't sell much from that. Still, if the vegetables were not grown, they would have to be bought, and I take all that into consideration in closing accounts. And that's one thing most farmers don't do; they don't put on the cash side of the ledger the cost of their living, for which they have been to no expense. Now, as to the bees. The first cost is about the only expense attached to these little workers. I have twenty-five colonies, and can, and do handle them with as much safety as if they were so much dry wheat. I sell about $100 worth of honey yearly, and consume half as much at home. The bees are not troublesome when you know how to handle them, but they require to be delicately handled at swarming time.

"Now, as to chickens. My stock consists exclusively of the light Brahma breed. They come early, grow fast, sell readily, are tender, and have no disposition to forage; they are not all the time wandering round and flying over the garden fence, and scratching up flower and vegetable seeds. In fact, if you'll notice, there is a docility about my live-stock that is very attractive. The cows and chickens only need articulation to carry on conversation. You didn't see the hatching department of my chicken-house? I modeled the building after one used by a Madame de Linas, a French lady living near Paris, and am much pleased with it. I sometimes raise 1,000 chickens a season. I sell them at prices all the way up from $1 to $3 apiece. You must remember that they are full-blooded, and I always have my stock replenished. I keep the best and sell for the highest prices. They are generally sold to private families, who wish to get the stock, and I always sell them alive. They are not much trouble to raise, provided you know how, and have the accommodations for doing it. I feed them corn, milk, meal and water, and pay particular attention to their being properly housed. The eggs of this breed are very rich, and I charge one dollar and a half for a setting—that is, thirteen eggs.

"I have some three or four acres of wheat growing and it is heading out finely. Oh!" said Mrs. Thomas, becoming more enthusiastic, as she reviewed the incomes from the cereals, cows, and chickens, "I am making money, and money is a standard of success, although there is to me a greater pleasure than the mere financial part of the business, which comes from the passion I have for the life. I wish, indeed, that young ladies would turn their attention to this matter. To me, it seems to open to them an avenue for acquiring a competency in an independent way; and to one who would pursue it earnestly, I know of no avocation scarcely worth being classed with it."

"And you are not lonesome out here?"

"Oh! no. I never was lonesome an hour in my life—don't have time; I have a great deal of work to do, and am always ready to do it. Indeed, the only people I pity are those who do not work, or find no interest in it. No, no; I have plenty of visitors, and last week Jennie June, Lucretia Mott, and Anna Dickinson paid me a visit and were very much pleased while here. I have two grown-up boys, one in New York and the other in California; and have reared thirteen children besides my own family—colored, French, Italian, and I know not what nationalities."

Mrs. Thomas, who is certainly a remarkable woman, is a thoroughly educated one; has traveled extensively both in Europe and this country. Herself and husband

have been intimate acquaintances of many eminent men, among whom were President Lincoln and Secretary Stanton. The activity displayed in managing the estate indicates the possession of marked executive ability, and the exercise she thus receives has doubtless had its share in keeping her young, well-preserved, and good-natured.

When the Rev. Knox Little visited this country in 1880, thinking the women of America specially needed his ministrations, he preached a sermon that called out the general ridicule of our literary women. In the Sunday *Republic* of December 12, Anne E. M'Dowell said:

The reverend gentlemen of St. Clement's Church, of this city, with their frequent English visiting clergymen, are not only trying their best to carry Christianity back into the dark ages, by reïnvesting it with all old-time traditions and mummeries, but they are striving anew to forge chains for the minds, consciences, and bodies of women whom the spirit of Christian progress has, in a measure, made free in this country. The sermon of the Rev. Knox Little, rector of St. Alban's Church, Manchester, England, recently delivered at St. Clement's in this city, and reported in the daily *Times*, is just such an one as might be looked for from the class of thinkers whom he on that occasion represented. These ritualistic brethren are bitterly opposed to divorce, and hold the belief that so many Britons adhere to on their native soil, viz., that "woman is an inferior animal, created only for man's use and pleasure, and designed by Providence to be in absolute submission to her lord and master." The feeling engendered by this belief breeds contempt for and indifference to the nobler aspirations of women amongst men of the higher ranks, while it crops out in tyranny in the middle, and brutality in the lower classes of society. Even the gentry and nobility of Great Britain are not all exempt from brutal manifestations of power toward their wives. We once sheltered in our own house for weeks the wife of an English Earl who had been forced to leave her home and family through the brutality of her high-born husband—brutality from which the law could not or would not protect her. She died at our house, and when she was robed for her last rest much care had to be taken to arrange the dress and hair so that the scars of wounds inflicted on the throat, neck and cheek by her cruel husband might not be too apparent.

The reports of English police courts are full of disclosures of ill-treatment of women by their husbands, and year by year our own courts are more densely thronged by women asking safety from the brutality of men who at the altar have vowed to "love, honor and protect" them. In nearly all these cases, the men who are brought into our courts on the charge of maltreating women are of foreign birth who have been born and brought up under the spiritual guidance of such clergymen as the Rev. Knox-Little, who tell them, as he told the audience of women to whom he preached in this city: "To her husband a wife owes the duty of unqualified obedience. There is *no crime that a man can commit which justifies his wife in leaving him* or applying for that monstrous thing, a divorce. It is her duty to submit herself to him *always*, and no crime he can commit justifies her lack of obedience. If he is a bad or wicked man she may gently remonstrate with him, but disobey him, never." Again, addressing his audience at St. Clement's, he says: "You may marry a bad man, but what of that? You had no right to marry a bad man. If you knew it, you deserved it. If you did not know it, you must endure it all the same. You can pray for him, and perhaps he will reform; but leave him—never. Never think of that accursed thing—divorce. Divorce breaks up families—families build up the church. The Christian woman lives to build up the church." This is the sort of sermonizing, reïterated from year to year, that makes brutes of Englishmen, of all classes, and sinks the average English woman to the condition of a child-bearing slave, valuable, mostly, for the number of children she brings her husband. She is permitted to hold no opinion unaccepted by her master, denied all reason and forced to frequent churches where she is forbidden the exercise of her common-sense, and where she is told: "Men are logical;

Digitized by Google

women lack this quality, but have an intricacy of thought. There are those who think that women can be taught logic; this is a mistake. They can never, by any process of education, arrive at the same mental status as that enjoyed by man; but they have a quickness of apprehension—what is usually called leaping at conclusions—that is astonishing."

Divorce is a question over which woman now disputes man's absolute control. His canon and civil laws alike have made marriage for her a condition of slavery, from which she is now seeking emancipation; and just in proportion as women become independent and self-supporting, they will sunder the ties that bind them in degrading relations.

In September, 1880, Governor Hoyt was petitioned to appoint a woman as member of the State Board of Commissioners of Public Charities. The special business of this commission is to examine into the condition of all charitable, reformatory and correctional institutions within the State, to have a general oversight of the methods of instruction, the well-being and comfort of the inmates, with a supervision of all those in authority in such institutions. Dr. Susan Smith of West Philadelphia, from the year of the cruel imprisonment of the unfortunate Hester Vaughan, regularly for twelve years poured petitions into both houses of the legislature, numerously signed by prominent philanthropists, setting forth the necessity of women as inspectors in the female wards of the jails of the State, and backing them by an array of appalling facts, and yet the legislature, from year to year, turned a deaf ear to her appeals. Happily for the unfortunate wards of the State, the law passed in 1881.

STATE HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE, NORRISTOWN, Pa., Sept. 28, 1885.

MY DEAR MISS ANTHONY: I have referred your letter to my old friend, Dr. Hiram Corson, of Plymouth, Pa., who can, if he will, give a much better history of the movement in this State, than any one else, being one of the pioneers. I hope that you will hear from him. If, however, he returns your letter to me, I will give you the few facts that I know. I should be glad to have you visit our hospital and see our work.

Very respectfully yours, ALICE BENNETT.

PLYMOUTH MEETING, Pa., Oct. 2, 1885.

MISS SUSAN B. ANTHONY: *Esteemed Friend:*—Dr. Alice Bennett has referred your letter with questions to me. Alice Bennett, M. D., Ph. D., is chief physician of the female department of the eastern hospital of Pennsylvania, for the insane. She is also member of the Montgomery County Medical Society, and member of the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania. She is the only woman in the civilized world, of whom I have ever heard, who has entire charge of the female patients in an institution for the care and treatment of the insane. We have in the Harrisburg hospital, Dr. Jane Garver, as

physician for the female insane, but she is subordinate to the male physician. She has a female physician to assist her. Dr. Bennett was appointed and took charge in July, 1880, with Dr. Anna Kingler as her assistant. Dr. Kingler resigned, and went to India as medical missionary; was succeeded by Dr. Rebecca S. Hunt, who, after more than a year's service, also resigned to go to India as medical missionary. Dr. Bennett has now two women physicians to assist her in the care of more than six hundred patients, nearly as many as, if not more than, are in the female departments of the Harrisburg, Danville, and Warren hospitals all combined.

Dr. Bennett's hospital is a model one. There is a total absence of physical restraint, as used formerly under male superintendents, and, I may say, as still used in other hospitals than that of Norristown. Her skill in providing amusement, instruction and employment of various kinds, for the comfort and restoration of her patients to sanity and physical health, I feel sure has never been equaled in any hospital for the treatment of insane women. It is exceedingly interesting to see the school which she has established, and in which a large number of the insane are daily instructed, amused and interested. It is well known, now, that when the mind of the insane can be drawn away from their delusions by employment, or whatever else may interest them and absorb their attention, they are on the road to health. The public are not yet fully awake to the great reform effected in having women physicians for the women insane. Insane women have been treated as though there were no diseases peculiar to the sex. Never, so far as I have been able to learn, have they been treated by the means used for the relief of women in their homes. An eminent surgeon of Philadelphia informed me a few days since, that thirty years ago he was an assistant to Dr. Kirkbride, and desired to treat a patient for uterine troubles, but was rebuked by Dr. K., and told never to attempt to use the appliances relied on in private practice. My informant added that he believed not a single insane woman had ever received special treatment for affections in any of the hospitals under the care of male physicians. While we realize that great advantages would have come to these poor unfortunates by proper treatment, we feel that no male physician having due regard for his own reputation, should attempt to treat an insane woman for uterine diseases by means used in private practice, or even in hospitals with sane women. And this shows the importance of women physicians for women insane. One of the most intellectual and prominent women of this State was, 30 years ago, on account of domestic application, an inmate of our then champion hospital for the insane, for several months, during all of which time her sufferings were, to use her own words, indescribable, and yet she was not once asked in relation to her physical condition. Let us turn aside from this, and glance at the last annual report of Dr. Alice Bennett. She reports 180 patients examined for uterine diseases; 125 were placed under treatment; 67 treated for a length of time; 60 benefited by treatment. While Dr. Bennett does not say that their insanity was caused by the uterine disease, or that they were cured by curing that affection, she observes that in some cases the relief of the mind kept pace with the prog-

ress of cure of the uterine affections. I have, perhaps, written more than was needed on this subject, but I am so anxious that we shall have women doctors in every hospital for the treatment of insane women, and know, too, what influence yourself and good Mrs. Stanton can exert by turning your attention to it, which I am sure you will as you become informed in relation to the facts, that I could not stop short of what I have said. I have prepared a full account of our struggles with the State Society during six years to obtain for women doctors their proper recognition by the profession, and also the obstacles and opposition we encountered in our attempt to procure the law empowering boards of trustees to appoint women to hospitals for the insane of their sex. It will give me pleasure to send them to you if they would be of any use to you.

Respectfully, HIRAM CORSON.

As I am within a week of my 82d birthday, and am writing while my heart is beating one hundred and sixty times per minute, you must not criticise me too sharply. H. C.

January 24, 1882, Miss Rachel Foster made all the arrangements for a national convention, to be held in St. George's Hall, Philadelphia.* She also inaugurated a course of lectures, of which she took the entire financial responsibility, in the popular hall of the Young Men's Christian Association. Ex-Governor Hoyt of Wyoming, in his lecture, gave the good results of thirteen years' experience of woman's voting in that Territory. Miss Foster employed a stenographer to report the address, had 20,000 copies printed, and circulated them in the Nebraska campaign during the following summer.

At its next session (1883) the legislature passed a resolution recommending congress to submit a sixteenth amendment, securing to women the right to vote:

HARRISBURG, Pa., March 21, 1883.—In the House, Mr. Morrison of Alleghany offered a resolution urging congress to amend the national constitution so that the right of suffrage should not be denied to citizens of any State on account of sex. It was adopted by 78 ayes† to 76 noes, the result being greeted with both applause and hisses.

The Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* of November 8, 1882, mentions an attempt to open the University of Pennsylvania to women:

---

* See Chapter 30 for an account of this Philadelphia convention.

† The *yeas* were as follows: Messrs. Ayers, Barnes, Blackford, Boyer, Boyle, Brooks, W. C. Brown, I. B. Brown, J. L. Brown, Brosius, Burnite, Burchfield, Chadwick, Coburn, E. L. Davis, Deveney, Duggan, Eckels, Ellsworth, Emery, Fetters, Gahan, Gardner, Gavitt, Gentner, Glenn, Grier, G. W. Hall, F. Hall, A. W. Hayes, Hines, Higgins, Hoofnagle, Hulings, Hughes, Jenkins, Klein, Kavanaugh, Landis, Lafferty, Merry, B. B. Mitchell, S. N. Mitchell, Millor, Molineaux, A. H. Morgan, W. D. Morgan, J. W. Morrison, E. Morrison, Myton, McCabe, McClaran, Neill, Neeley, Nelson, Nesbit, Nicholson, Parkinson, Powell, Romig, Schwartz, Short, Sinex, Slocum, J. Smith, Sneeringer, Snodgrass, Stees, Sterett, Stewart, Stubbs, Sweeney, Trant, Vanderslice, Vaughn, Vogdes, Wayne and Ziegler—78.

The trustees held several meetings to consider the applications. Beside Miss Craddock's, there were two others which the faculty referred to the trustees, and which appear not to have been reached in the regular course of business. Miss Florence Kelley, a post-graduate from Cornell University, daughter of Judge Kelley, who applied for admission as a special student in Greek, and Miss Frances Henrietta Mitchell, a junior student from Cornell, who asked to be admitted in the junior class. Our information comes from these ladies, who were notified that their cases would be presented. The question of coëducation, which has been seriously occupying the minds of the trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, was settled last evening, at least for the present, by the passage of a resolution refusing the admission of girls to the department of arts, but proposing to establish a separate collegiate department for them, whenever the requisite cost, about $300,000, is provided. There has been an intelligent and honest difference among both trustees and professors on this interesting question, and the diversity has been complicated by the various grounds upon which the *pros* and *cons* are maintained. There are those who advocate the admission of girls to the University as a proper thing *per se*. Others consent to it, because the University cannot give the desired education separately. Others hold that girls should be admitted because of their equal rights to a university education, although their admission is very undesirable. Others oppose coëducation in the abstract, conceding that girls should be as well educated as boys, but insisting that they must be differently and therefore separately educated. These draw a clear line between "equal" and "similar" education, and hold that no university course of studies can be laid out that will not present much of classical literature and much of the mental, moral and natural sciences, that cannot be studied and recited by boys and girls together, without serious risk of lasting injury to both.

Would it not be better, all things considered, to abjure this kind of classical literature, and instead of subjecting our sons to its baneful influence, give them the refining, elevating companionship of their sisters? If we would preserve the real modesty and purity of our daughters, it is quite as important that we should pay some attention to the delicacy and morality of the men with whom they are to associate.

If a girl cannot read the classics with a young man without contamination, how can she live with him in all the intimacies of family life without a constant shock to her refined sensibilities? So long as society considers that any man of known wealth is a fit husband for our daughters, all this talk of the faculties and trustees of our colleges about protecting woman's modesty is the sheerest nonsense and hypocrisy. It is well to remember that these professors and students have mothers, wives and sisters, and if man is coarse and brutal, he invariably feels free to show his worst passions at his own fireside. To warn women against coëducation is to warn them against association with men in any relation whatsoever.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XXXIX.

NEW JERSEY.

Women Voted in the Early Days—Deprived of the Right by Legislative Enactment in 1807—Women Demand the Restoration of Their Rights in 1868—At the Polls in Vineland and Roseville Park—Lucy Stone Agitates the Question—State Suffrage Society Organized in 1867—Conventions—A Memorial to the Legislature—Mary F. Davis—Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford—Political Science Club—Mrs. Cornelia C. Hussey—Orange Club, 1870—July 4, 1874, Mrs. Devereux Blake Gives the Oration—Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell's Letter—The Laws of New Jersey in Regard to Property and Divorce—Constitutional Commission, 1873—Trial of Rev. Isaac M. See—Women Preaching in His Pulpit—The Case Appealed—Mrs. Jones, Jailoress—Legislative Hearings.

NEW JERSEY was the only State that, in adopting her first constitution, recognized woman's right to suffrage which she had exercised during the colonial days, and from time immemorial in the mother country. The fact that she was deprived of this right from 1807 to 1840 by a legislative enactment, while the constitution secured it,* proves that the power of the legislature, composed of representatives from the people, was considered at that early day to be above the State constitution. If, then, the legislature could abridge the suffrage, it must have the power to extend it, and all the women of this State should demand is an act of the legislature. They need not wait for the slow process of a constitutional amendment submitted to the popular vote. In 1868, in harmony with a general movement in many other States, the women of New Jersey began to demand the restoration of their ancient rights. The following is from *The Revolution* of November 19, 1868, written by Elizabeth A. Kingsbury:

VINELAND, N. J., Nov. 5, 1868.

At a meeting of women, held the week before election, a unanimous vote was taken that we would go to the polls. John Gage, chairman of the Woman Suffrage Association of Vineland, called a meeting, and though the day was an inclement one, there was a good attendance. A number of earnest men as well as women addressed

* See Vol. I., page 447.

Digitized by Google

the audience. Among them were Colonel Moss of Missouri, and James M. Scovel of Camden, State senator, who strengthened us by their words of earnest eloquence. At 7:30 A. M., November 3, John and Portia Gage and myself entered Union Hall, where the judges of election had already established themselves for the day. Instead of occupying the center of the platform, they had taken one side of it, apparently for the purpose of leaving us room on the other. We seated ourselves in chairs brought for the occasion, when one gentleman placed a small table for our use. Another inquired if we were comfortable and the room sufficiently warm. "Truly," we thought, "this does not look like a very terrible opposition." As time passed, there came more men and women into the hall. Quite a number of the latter presented their votes first at the table where those of men were received, where they were rejected with politeness, and then taken to the other side of the platform and deposited in our box. Shall I describe this box, twelve inches long and six wide, and originally a grape-box? Very significant of Vineland. Soon there came to the aid of Mrs. Gage and myself a blooming and beautiful young lady, Estelle Thomson, who, with much grace and dignity, sat there throughout the day, recording the names of the voters. It would have done you good to have witnessed the scene. Margaret Pryor,* who is better known to you perhaps than to many of your readers, as one whose life has been active in the cause of freedom for the negro and for woman; a charming old lady of eighty-four years, yet with the spirit, elasticity and strength of one of thirty-five, sat there in her nice Quaker bonnet by the side of Miss Thomson a great part of the day. Sarah Pearson, also advanced in years and eminent for her labors of love for the suffering and oppressed everywhere; with her peculiarly delicate organization and placid countenance, remained with us till the last moment. There was no lack of friends and supporters. The platform was crowded with earnest, refined, intellectual women, who felt that it was good for them to be there. One beautiful girl said in my hearing, "I feel so much stronger for having voted." It was pleasant to see husbands and wives enter the hall together, only they had to separate, one turning to the right hand and the other to the left, when no separation should have taken place.

Some women spent the day in going after their friends and bringing them to the hall. Young ladies, after voting, went to the homes of their acquaintances, and took care of the babies while the mothers came out to vote. Will this fact lessen the alarm of some men for the safety of the babies of enfranchised women on election day? One lady of refinement and aristocratic birth brought her little girl of ten years with her, and I assure you it did the men good as well as us. They said they never had so quiet and pleasant a time at the polls before, though it is always more quiet here than in many other towns, because the sale of ardent spirits is forbidden. John Gage—bless his dear soul—identifies himself completely with this glorious cause, and labors with an earnestness and uniformity of purpose that is truly charming. His team was out all day, bringing women to vote, half-a-dozen at a time, while his personal efforts were unremitting and eminently successful. He and his noble wife, Portia, seem to be, indeed, one in thought and action. Some time ago he sent a pledge to the candidates for office in this State. By signing it, they promise to sustain the cause of woman suffrage by every means in their power. Nixon, candidate for the Senate, signed it last year. House, candidate for the Assembly, signed the pledge at the eleventh hour, and though he lost two of our votes by the delay, yet he, too, is elected. Thus we have, at least, three public men in New Jersey pledged to sustain

* Mrs. Pryor lived formerly in Waterloo, New York. She was present at the first convention at Seneca Falls, and sustained the demand for woman suffrage with earnest sympathy. I have been indebted to her for a splendid housekeeper, trained by her in all domestic accomplishments, who lived in my family for thirty years, a faithful, devoted friend to me and my children. Much that I have enjoyed and accomplished in life is due to her untiring and unselfish services. My cares were the lighter for all the heavy burdens she willingly took on her shoulders. The name of Amelia Willard should always be mentioned with loving praise by me and mine. Her sympathies have ever been in our reform. When Abby Kelly was a young girl, speaking through New York in the height of the anti-slavery mobs, Margaret Pryor traveled with her for company and protection. Abby used to say she always felt safe when she could see Margaret Pryor's Quaker bonnet.—[E. C. S.

the woman suffrage cause. We think it is time to say to candidates for office: "You tell us we have a good deal of influence, and ask us to exert it for your election. We will do so, if you will promise to advocate our cause. If you do not, we will oppose your election." The result of the ballots cast by the women of Vineland is this: For president—Grant, 164; Seymour, 4; E. Cady Stanton, 2; Fremont, 1; and Mrs. Governor Harvey of Wisconsin, 1. The president of the Historical Society of Vineland, S. C. Campbell, has petitioned for the ballot-box and list of voters, to put into its archives. He will probably get them.

A gentleman said to me last week: "What is the use of your doing this? Your votes will count nothing in the election." "It will do good in two ways," I replied. "You say there will not be five women there. We will show you that you are mistaken; that women do want to vote, and it will strengthen them for action in the future." Both these ends have been accomplished; and on November 12 we are to meet again, to consider and decide what to do about the taxation that is soon coming upon us.

While the Vineland women expressed their opinion by voting, other true friends of woman's enfranchisement were moved to do the same. *The Revolution* of November 12, 1868, gave the following:

The Newark *Daily Advertiser* says that Mrs. Hannah Blackwell, a highly esteemed elderly lady, long resident in Roseville, and Mrs. Lucy Stone, her daughter-in-law, both of them property-holders and tax-payers in the county, appeared at the polls in Roseville Park, accompanied by Messrs. Bathgate and Blackwell as witnesses, and offered their votes. The judges of election were divided as to the propriety of receiving the votes of the ladies, one of them stating that he was in favor of doing so, the two others objecting on the ground of their illegality. The ladies stated that they had taken advice of eminent lawyers, and were satisfied that in New Jersey, women were legally entitled to vote, from the fact that the old constitution of the State conferred suffrage upon "all inhabitants" worth $250. Under that constitution women did in fact vote until, in 1807, by an arbitrary act of the legislature, women were excluded from the polls. The new constitution, adopted in 1844, was framed by a convention and adopted by a constituency, from both of which women were unconstitutionally excluded, so that they have never been allowed to vote upon the question of their own disfranchisement. The article in the present constitution on the right of suffrage confers it upon white male citizens, but does not expressly limit it to such. It is claimed that from the absence of any express limitation in the present constitution, and from the compulsory exclusion of the parties interested from its adoption, the political rights of women under the old constitution still remain. Mrs. Stone stated these points to the judges of election with clearness and precision. After consultation, the votes of the ladies were refused. The crowd surrounding the polls gathered about the ballot-box and listened to the discussion with respectful attention; but every one behaved with the politeness which gentlemen always manifest in the presence of ladies.

The women of New Jersey may have been roused to assert their right to vote by an earnest appeal of that veteran of equal rights, Parker Pillsbury, in *The Revolution* of March 25, 1868, suggested by the following:

At the recent election in Vineland, New Jersey, a unanimous vote in favor of "no rum" was polled. The Vineland *Weekly* says: "Among the incidents of the late election was the appearance of a woman at the polls. Having provided herself with a ballot, she marched up to the rostrum and tendered it to the chairman of the board of registry. The veteran politician, John Kandle, covered with blushes, was obliged to inform the lady that no one could vote unless his name was registered.

Digitized by Google

She acquiesced in the decision very readily, saying she only wished to test a principle, and retired very quietly from the hall."

While thus mentioning the women with uncounted votes, it may be well to embalm here a historical fact, published in April, 1868:

In the year 1824 widows were allowed to vote in New Jersey on their husbands' tax receipts. The election officers paid great deference to the widows on these occasions, and took particular care to send carriages after them, so as to get their votes early and make sure of them. The writer of this has often heard his grandmother state that she voted for John Quincy Adams for president of the United States when he was elected to that office. Her name was Sarah Sparks, and she voted at Barnsboro', her husband having died the year previous.

N. M. WALLINGTON, Washington, D. C.

Miss Anthony held a spirited meeting in Rahway on Christmas eve, December 24, 1867. The following October, 1868, Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony attended a two days' convention in Vineland, and helped to rouse the enthusiasm of the people. A friend, writing from there, gives us the following:

The Unitarian church in this town is highly favored in having for its pastor a young man of progressive and thoroughly liberal ideas. Rev. Oscar Clute is well known as an earnest advocate in the cause of woman. Last Sunday the communion or Lord's Supper was administered in his church. One of the laymen who usually assists in the distribution of the bread and wine, was absent, and Mr. Clute invited one of the women to officiate in his stead. She did so in such a sweet and hospitable manner that it gave new interest to the occasion. Even those who do not like innovations could not find fault. And why should any one be displeased? The Christ of the sacrament was the emancipator of women. In olden time they had deaconesses, and in most of our churches women constitute a majority of the communicants, so it seems particularly appropriate that they should be served by women. Women vote on all matters connected with this church, they are on all "standing committees," and sometimes are chosen and act as trustees.

Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford sends us the following reports of the progress of the movement in this State:

While Lucy Stone resided in New Jersey, she held several series of meetings in the chief towns and cities before the formation of the State Society.* The agitation that began in 1867 was probably due to her, more than to any other one person in that State. The State society was organized in the autumn of 1867, and from year to year its annual meetings have been held in Vineland, Newark, Trenton, and other cities. On its list of officers† are some of the best men and women in the State.

* In a letter to Mary F. Davis, February 13, 1882, asking her for some facts in regard to that period, Lucy Stone says: "I have never kept any diary or record of my work. I have been too busy with the work itself. I could not answer your questions without a search among old letters and papers, which have been packed away for years, and I have not time to make the search, and cannot be accurate without. I know we had many meetings in New Jersey in all the large towns, beginning in Newark and Orange, and following the line of the railroad to Trenton, Camden, and Vineland, and then another series that included towns reached by stage, Salem being one, but I cannot tell whether these meetings were before or after the formation of the State Society." The records show that they were before, says Mrs. Davis; newspaper reports of them are in the archives of the Historical Society.

† *President*, Lucy Stone, Roseville; *Vice-Presidents*, Antoinette Brown Blackwell, Thomas B. Peddie, Portia Gage, Rev. Robert McMurdy, Cornelia Collins Hussey, George T. Cobb, Sarah E. Webb,

Digitized by Google

Several distinguished names from other States are among the speakers* who have taken part in their conventions. County and local societies too have been extensively organized. These associations have circulated tracts and appeals, memorialized the legislature, and had various hearings before that body. At the annual meeting held in Newark February 15, 1871, the following memorial to the legislature, prepared by Mary F. Davis, was unanimously adopted:

To the Honorable the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

Section 2, Article 1, of the constitution of the State of New Jersey, expressly declares that "All political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for the protection, security, and benefit of the people, and they have the right at all times to alter or reform the same, whenever the public good may require it." Throughout the entire article the words "people" and "person" are used, as if to apply to all the inhabitants of the State. In direct contradiction to this broad and just affirmation, section 1, article 2, begins with the restrictive and unjust sentence: "Every white male citizen of the United States, at the age of twenty-one years * * * shall be entitled to vote," etc., and the section ends with the specification that "no pauper, idiot, insane person, or person convicted of a crime * * * shall enjoy the right of an elector."

Of the word "white" in this article your memorialists need not speak, as it is made a dead letter by the limitations of the fifteenth amendment to the United States constitution. To the second restriction, indicated by the word "male" we beg leave to call the attention of the legislature, as we deem it unjust and arbitrary, as well as contradictory to the spirit of the constitution, as expressed in the first article. It is also contrary to the precedent established by the founders of political liberty in New Jersey. On the second of July, 1776, the provincial congress of New Jersey, at Burlington, adopted a constitution which remained in force until 1844, in which section 4 specified as voters, "all the inhabitants of this Colony, of full age," etc. In 1790, a committee of the legislature reported a bill regulating elections, in which the words "he and she" are applied to voters, thus giving legislative endorsement to the alleged meaning of the constitution.

The legislature of 1807 departed from this wise and just precedent, and passed an arbitrary act, in direct violation of the constitutional provision, restricting the suffrage to white male adult citizens, and this despotic ordinance was deliberately endorsed by the framers of the State constitution which was adopted in 1844. This was plainly an act of usurpation and injustice, as thereby a large proportion of the law-abiding citizens of the State were disfranchised, without so much as the privilege of signifying their acceptance or rejection of the barbarous fiat which was to rob them of the sacred right of self-protection by means of a voice in the government, and to reduce them to the political level of the "pauper, idiot, insane person, or person convicted of crime."

If this flagrant wrong, which was inflicted by one-half the citizens of a free commonwealth on the other half, had been aimed at any other than a non-aggressive and self-sacrificing class, there would have been fierce resistance, as in the case of the United Colonies under the British yoke. It has long been borne in silence. "The right of voting for representatives," says Paine, "is the primary right, by which other rights

---

Dr. James Brotherton, Isaac Stevens, Rev. H. A. Butler, A. J. Davis, James H. Nixon, Dr. G. H. Haskell, I. M. Peebles, Rev. C. H. Dezanne, William Baldwin; *Corresponding Secretaries*, Phebe A. Pierson, Miss P. Fowler; *Recording Secretary*, C. A. Paul; *Treasurer*, S. G. Silvester; *Executive Committee*, Mary F. Davis, Mrs. E. L. Bush, H. B. Blackwell, Rev. Oscar Clute, Miss Charlotte Bathgate, Rowland Johnson, Mrs. Robert McMurdy, Dr. D. N. Allen, Sarah Pierson, Lizzie Prentice, W. D. Conan, John Whitehead.

* Among those who addressed the conventions and the legislature we find the names of Lucretia Mott, Ernestine L. Rose, Lucy Stone, Antoinette Brown Blackwell, Mary F. Davis, Charlotte B. Wilbour, Elizabeth R. Churchill, Elizabeth A. Kingsbury, Deborah Butler, Olive F. Stevens, Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford, Mrs. Devereux Blake, Rev. Oscar Clute, Rev. Olympia Brown, Rev. Mr. McMurdy, Mr. Taylor, John Whitehead, Mrs. Seagrove, Henry B. Blackwell, Hon. James Scovell.

Cornelia Collins Hussey

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

are protected. To take away this right is to reduce man to a state of slavery, for slavery consists in being subject to the will of another, and he that has not a vote in the electing of representatives is in this condition. Benjamin Franklin wrote: "They who have no voice nor vote in the electing of representatives do not enjoy liberty, but are absolutely enslaved to those who have votes and to their representatives; for to be enslaved is to have governors whom other men have set over us, and be subject to laws made by the representatives of others, without having had representatives of our own to give consent in our behalf." This is the condition of the women of New Jersey. It is evident to every reasonable mind that these unjustly disfranchised citizens should be reïnstated in the right of suffrage. Therefore, we, your memorialists, ask the legislature at its present session to submit to the people of New Jersey an amendment to the constitution, striking out the word "male" from article 2, section 1, in order that the political liberty which our forefathers so nobly bestowed on men and women alike, may be restored to "all inhabitants" of the populous and prosperous State into which their brave young colony has grown.

With but a slight change of officers and arguments, these conventions were similar from year to year. There were on all occasions a certain number of the clergy in opposition. At one of these meetings the Rev. Mr. McMurdy condemned the ordination of women for the ministry. But woman's fitness* for that profession was successfully vindicated by Lucretia Mott and Phebe A. Hanaford. Mrs. Portia Gage writes, December 12, 1873:

There was an election held by the order of the township committee of Landis, to vote on the subject of bonding the town to build shoe and other factories. The call issued was for all legal voters. I went with some ten or twelve other women, all taxpayers. We offered our votes, claiming that we were citizens of the United States, and of the State of New Jersey, also property-holders in and residents of Landis township, and wished to express our opinion on the subject of having our property bonded. Of course our votes were not accepted, whilst every *tatterdemalion* in town, either black or white, who owned no property, stepped up and very pompously said what he would like to have done with his property. For the first time our claim to vote seemed to most of the voters to be a just one. They gathered together in groups and got quite excited over the injustice of refusing our vote and accepting those of men who paid no taxes.

In 1879, the Woman's Political Science Club† was formed in Vineland, which held its meetings semi-monthly, and discussed a wide range of subjects. Among the noble women in New Jersey who have stood for many years steadfast representatives of the suffrage movement, Cornelia Collins Hussey of Orange is worthy of mention. A long line of radical and brave ancestors‡ made it comparatively easy for her to advocate an unpopular

* This has been well illustrated by Mrs. Hanaford in her own case, she having preached for nearly twenty years with but three changes of place, and ten of these passed successively in the Universalist churches in Jersey City.—[E. C. S.

† VINELAND, July 15, 1879.—Club met at the residence of Mrs. Bristol. The meeting was opened with music by Mrs. Parkhurst, followed by a recitation by Miss Etta Taylor. Mrs. Andrew read an excellent essay, opposing the national bank system. Mrs. Bristol gave an instructive lesson in political economy on "Appropriation." The next lesson will be upon "Changes of Matter in Place." Appropriate remarks were made by Mrs. Neyman of New York, Mr. Broom, Mrs. Duffey and Mr. Bristol. Several new names were added to the list of membership. Miss Etta Taylor gave another recitation, which closed the exercises of the afternoon. In the evening a pleasant reception was held, and many invited guests were present. The exercises consisted of vocal and instrumental music, social converse and dancing. The club will meet again in two weeks.—[C. L. LADD, *Secretary*.

‡ Isaac Collins, her grandfather, died at Burlington, March 21, 1817, a man remarkable alike for his uprightness, industry, intelligence and enterprise. He was a Quaker by birth and conviction, and a printer, appointed by King George III. for the province of New Jersey. He printed many valuable

Digitized by Google

cause. Her father, Stacy B. Collins, identified with the anti-slavery movement, was also an advocate of woman's right to do whatever she could, even to the exercise of the suffrage. He maintained that the tax-payer should vote regardless of sex, and as years passed on he saw clearly that not alone the tax-payer, but every citizen of the United States governed and punished by its laws, had a just and natural right to the ballot in a country claiming to be republican. The following beautiful tribute to his memory, by Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, is found in a letter to his daughter:

LONDON, July 27, 1873.

My last letter from America brought me the sad intelligence of your dear father's departure from amongst you; and I cannot refrain from at once writing and begging you to accept the sincere sympathy and inevitable regret which I feel for your loss. The disappearance of an old friend brings up the long past times vividly to my remembrance—the time when, impelled by irresistible spiritual necessity, I strove to lead a useful but unusual life, and was able to face, with the energy of youth, both social prejudice and the hindrance of poverty. I have to recall those early days to show how precious your father's sympathy and support were to me in that difficult time; and how highly I respected his moral courage in steadily, for so many years, encouraging the singular woman doctor, at whom everybody looked askance, and in passing whom so many women held their clothes aside, lest they should touch her. I know in how many good and noble things your father took part; but, to me, this brave advocacy of woman as physician, in that early time, seems the noblest of his actions.

Speaking of the general activity of the women of Orange, Mrs Hussey says:

The Women's Club of Orange was started in 1871. It is a social and literary club, and at present (1885) numbers about eighty members. Meetings are held in the rooms of the New England Society once in two weeks, and a reception, with refreshments, given at the house of some member once a year. Some matter of interest is discussed at each regular meeting. This is not an equal suffrage club, yet a steady growth in that direction is very evident. Very good work has been done by this club. An evening school for girls was started by it, and taught by the members for awhile, until adopted by the board of education, a boys' evening school being already in operation. Under the arrangements of the club, a course of lectures on physiology, by women, was recently given in Orange, and well attended. At the house of one of the members a discussion was held on this subject: "Does the Private Character of the Actor Concern the Public?" Although the subject was a general one, the discussion was really upon the proper course in regard to M'lle Sarah Bernhardt, who had recently arrived in the country. Reporters from the New York *Sun* attended the meeting, so that the views of the club of Orange gained quite a wide celebrity.

Of Mrs. Hussey's remarks, the Newark *Journal* said:

The sentiments of the first speaker, Mrs. Cornelia C. Hussey, were generally approved, and therefore are herewith given in full: "I have so often maintained in argument that one has no right to honor those whose lives are a dishonor to virtue or principle, that I cannot see any other side to our question than the affirmative. That the stage wields a potent influence cannot be doubted. Let the plays be immoral, and its influence must be disastrous to virtue. Let the known character of the actor be what we cannot respect, the glamour which his genius or talent throws around that bad character will tend to diminish our discrimination between virtue and vice, and

---

books, almanacs, Bibles, revised laws, government money, and a weekly paper, *The New Jersey Gazette*. In making his will he so divided his property that each of his six daughters received twice the sum that he gave to each of the seven sons. This he explained by saying that the latter could go into business and support themselves, but his daughters must have enough to live upon, if they chose to remain single; he did not wish them to be forced to marry for a support.

Digitized by Google

our distaste for the latter. Some one says: 'Let me write the songs of a nation, and I care not who makes the laws.' The poetry that Byron wrote, together with his well-known contempt for a virtuous life, is said to have had a very pernicious influence on the young men of his time, and probably, too, blinded the eyes of the young women. I recall being quite startled by reading the essay of Whittier on Byron, which showed him as he was, and not with the halo of his great genius thrown around his vices. It seemed to me that our national government dethroned virtue when it sent a homicide, if not a murderer, to represent us at a foreign court; and again when it sent as minister to another court on the coutinent a man whose private character was well known to be thoroughly immoral. Even to trifle with virtue, or to be a coward in the cause of principle, is a fearful thing; but when, a person comes before the public, saying by his life that he prefers the pleasures of sin to the paths of virtue, it seems to me that the way is plain—to withhold our patronage as a matter of public policy."

On the Fourth of July, 1874, Mrs. Lillie Devereux Blake was invited to make the usual address in East Orange, which she did before a large audience in the public hall. Says the *Journal:* "Mrs. Blake's speech was characterized by simplicity of style and appropriateness of sentiment." She made mention of Molly Pitcher, Mrs. Borden and Mrs. Hall of New Jersey, and of noted women of other States, who did good service in Revolutionary times, when the country needed the help of her daughters as well as her sons.

In the summer of 1876 a noteworthy meeting was held in Orange in the interest of women. A number of ladies and gentlemen met in my parlor to listen to statements in relation to what is called the "social evil." to be made by the Rev. J. P. Gledstone and Mr. Henry J. Wilson, delegates from the "British, Continental and General Federation for the Abolition of Government Regulation of Prostitution." It is due to the English gentlemen to say that they gave some very strong reasons for bringing the disagreeable subject before the meeting, and that they handled it with becoming delicacy, though with great plainness.

"Ann A. Horton, who died in June, 1875, at the Old Ladies' Home, Newark, bequeathed $2,000 to Princeton College, to found a scholarship to be called by her name." Would not the endowment of a "free bed" in Mrs. Horton's true alma-mater, the Old Ladies' Home, have been a far wiser bequest than the foundation of a scholarship in Princeton—a college which, while fattening on enormous dole received from women, offers them nothing in return?

In relation to the law giving the mothers of New Jersey some legal claim to their children, Mrs. Hussey writes:

I have often heard it said that Kansas is the only State where the married mother has any legal ownership in her children; but the women of New Jersey have enjoyed this *privilege* since 1871, when it was gained for them by the efforts of Mrs. Ann H. Connelly of Rahway. She was an American woman, the mother of one daughter, and unhappily married. She desired to be divorced from her husband, but she knew that in such case he might legally take her child from her. Such a risk could not be thought of for a moment; so she applied to the legislature for a change of the law. She was assisted by many influential citizens, both men and women; petitions largely signed were presented, and the result was the amendment of the law making the mother and father equal in the ownership of their children. When a copy of the new law appeared in our papers I wrote to Mrs. Connelly, inclosing a resolution of thanks from the Essex County Woman Suffrage Society, of which I was then secretary. In her reply she said: "This unexpected and distinguishing recognition of my imperfect, but earnest, efforts for justice is inexpressibly gratifying." Several years after, I went with my daughter to Rahway to see Mrs. Connelly. She seemed to be well known and much respected. She was teaching in one of the public schools, but seemed quite feeble in health. In 1881 I saw the notice of her death. She was a woman of much intelligence, and strongly interested in suffrage, and should certainly be held in grateful remembrance by the mothers of New Jersey, to whom she restored

the right which nature gave them, but which men had taken away by mistaken legislation.

This law of February 21, 1871, composed of several acts purporting to give fathers and mothers equal rights in cases of separation and divorce, is not so liberal as it seems in considering this provision:

Upon a decree of divorce the court may make such further decree as may be deemed expedient concerning the custody and maintenance of minor children, and determine with which of the parents the children shall remain.

This act, though declaring that the mother and father are equal, soon shows by its specifications that the courts can dispose of all woman's interests and affections as they may see fit. What avails a decree of divorce or separation for woman, if the court can give the children to the father at its pleasure? Here is the strong cord by which woman is held in bondage, and the courts, all composed of men, know this, and act on it in their decisions.

A petition was addressed to the constitutional commission of 1873, requesting an amendment restoring to the women of New Jersey their original right to vote, which that body decided would be "inexpedient." A bill introduced in the legislature by Senator Cutler, of Morris county, making women eligible to the office of school-trustee, became a law March 25, 1873:

Be it enacted, That hereafter no person shall be eligible to the office of school-trustee, unless he or she can read and write; and women who are residents in the district and over twenty years of age, shall also be eligible to the office of school-trustee, and may hold such office and perform the duties of the same, when duly elected by ten votes of the district.—[Chap. 386.

February 26, 1874, a law for the better protection of the property of married women was passed:

1. Be it enacted by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, That any married woman who now is, or may hereafter become, entitled, by gift, devise or bequest, to any contingent estate, or any interest in any real or personal property or estate, may, with the concurrence of her husband, compound and receipt for, assign and convey the same, in all cases where she lawfully might, if a *feme sole;* and every release, receipt, assignment, discharge, agreement, covenant, or contract, thereupon entered into by her in regard to the same and to the said property, shall be as valid and binding in every respect, upon her, her heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns, and any and all persons claiming under her, them or either of them, as if she were at the time of entering into the same, a *feme sole*, and when duly executed and acknowledged in the manner provided by law for conveyance of real estate, may be recorded in the surrogate's office, and whenever it relates to real estate in the clerk's or recorder's office, of the proper county or counties, in the same manner and with like effect as other receipts and discharges may now be recorded therein. 2. And be it enacted, That this act shall take effect immediately.

A most remarkable trial, lately held in Newark, New Jersey, which involved the question whether it was contrary to Scripture, and a violation of the rules of the Presbyterian Church, to admit women to the pulpit, is well reported by the New York *World*, January 1, 1877:

Since the time that the Rev. Theodore Cuyler was obliged by the Presbytery of Long Island to apologize for inviting Miss Sarah Smiley, the Quaker preacher, to occupy the pulpit of the Lafayette Avenue Church in Brooklyn, the question of the right of women

Digitized by Google

to preach in Presbyterian churches, has come up in various parts of the country, but has never been brought judicially before any ecclesiastical body until yesterday, when it occupied the attention of the Newark Presbytery, under the following circumstances. October 29, 1876, Mrs. L. S. Robinson and Mrs. C. S. Whiting, two ladies who were much interested in the temperance movement, asked and received permission of the Rev. Isaac M. See, of the Wickliffe Presbyterian Church at Newark, to occupy his pulpit, morning and evening of that day. They accordingly addressed the congregation on the subject of temperance. To this the Rev. E. R. Craven, of the Third Presbyterian Church, of Newark, objected, and brought before the Newark Presbytery the following charge:

"The undersigned charges the Rev. Isaac M. See, pastor of the Wickliffe Church, of Newark, N. J., a member of your body, with disobedience to the divinely enacted ordinance in reference to the public speaking and teaching of women in churches, as recorded in I. Corinthians, xiv., 33 to 37, and I. Timothy, ii., 13, in that: First specification—On Sunday, October 29, 1876, in the Wickliffe Church of the city of Newark, N. J., he did, in the pulpit of the said church, and before the congregation there assembled for public worship at the usual hour of the morning service, viz., 10:30 A. M., introduce a woman, whom he permitted and encouraged then and there publicly to preach and teach." The second specification is couched in similar language, except that it charges Mr. See with introducing another woman at the evening service upon the same day. The charge was presented at the regular meeting of the Presbytery, a short time ago, and the hearing of the case was adjourned until yesterday. The meeting was held in the lecture room of the Second Presbyterian Church in Washington street. Rev. John L. Wells, pastor of the Bethany Mission Chapel, presided, and there was a fair attendance of the members of the body. Of the audience at least nine-tenths were women.* Dr. Craven, the prosecutor, sat on the front row of seats, near to the clerk's table, while Dr. See, who is very stout, with a double chin, and the picture of good-nature, sat in the rear of the members of the Presbytery, and among the front rows of spectators. Dr. McIllvaine introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That this charge, by common consent of the parties, be dismissed at this stage of the proceedings, with affectionate council to the Rev. Dr. See not to go contrary to the usages of the Presbyterian Church for the future.

This brought Brother See to his feet. He could not, he said, assent to Brother McIllvaine's resolution. He had not consented that the charge should be dismissed, as in the resolution. Brother McIllvaine expressed himself as sure that Brother See had consented, but Brother See was again equally sure that he had not. Some member here suggested that Dr. Craven should first have been asked if he consented to dismiss the charge, and this brought that gentleman to his feet. A more complete antithesis to Dr. See cannot be imagined. He is tall, gaunt, with full beard and mustache, short, bristling hair, that stands upright in a row from the centre of his forehead to the crown of his head. He said that at the request of Dr. McIllvaine and another respected member of the Presbytery he had said that if the party charged would give full and free consent to the resolution, he would also assent; "and," he added, "such is now my position." Dr. McIllvaine then gave at length his reasons for desiring to arrest the case where it was. No good could come of its discussion, and the result could not but be productive of discord. The Moderator reminded Dr. See that they waited for an answer from him.

---

* In the audience were several advocates of woman suffrage, probably there to take observations of the manner in which Christian clergymen conduct their meetings. This class of men had been so severe in their criticisms of woman suffrage conventions that we hoped to learn lessons of wisdom from the dignity, refinement and parliamentary order of their proceedings. Among these ladies were Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford, Miss Arathusia Forbes, Mrs. Devereux Blake and Miss Susan King of New York, a wealthy tea-merchant and extensive traveler, and myself. That day the Rev. Dr. Craven was the principal speaker. The whole tenor of his remarks were so insulting to women that Miss King proposed to send an artist the following Sunday to photograph the women possessing so little self-respect as to sit under his ministrations. He punctuated his four-hours' vulgar diatribe by a series of resounding whacks with the Bible on the table before him.—[M. J. G.

Dr. See—May we have a season of prayer, sir? The Moderator said there was no objection. Dr. See explained that the matter at issue was not a personal one; it was a question as to the meaning of the Scriptures upon a certain point, and he was there simply to know what the Presbytery would do. Rev. Drs. Brinsmayd and Fewsmith then prayed, but Dr. See's frame of mind was not in the least changed. He still insisted that his was the passive part, to sit and see what they would do with his case. Rev. Dr. Wilson thought that if Brother See did not desire to do anything contrary to the usages of the church, he might say so. Brother See said it was a question of whether God Almighty had said certain things or not, and that he could not answer. In his formal answer to the charge the accused then said: "I believe myself to be not guilty of the charge, but I admit the specifications." Dr. Craven, in his speech, said it was in no spirit of animosity that he had brought the charge. He believed that the law of God had been broken in this case; not designedly, perhaps, but really. A custom had found lodgment in a Presbyterian church that would impair its efficiency and would also injure woman in the sphere which she was called upon by God to fill. No judicial decision had been arrived at upon this question. The case of Dr. Cuyler was the first that had come before a Presbytery, and that was hardly a trial of the question. "Why should I," he continued, "bring this charge? Because I have felt it to be wrong, and feeling thus, resolved to take the duty upon myself, painful and agonizing as the task may be. I deem it my duty to God to do so." Dr. See (*sotto voce*)—"And the Lord will bless you for it."

Dr. Craven, continuing, read the passages of Scripture referred to in this charge. He did not, he said, affirm that woman had no work in the church. She had a great and glorious sphere; she had no right to teach and speak in public meetings, but she could teach children and ignorant men in private. He would not affirm that some women could not preach as well as, or better than some men, and he did not know but that in the future she might occupy the platform on an equality with men; but at present she could not, and it was expressly forbidden in the passages which he had read. "You may run to hear another man's wife preach, or another man's daughter," said he, "but who would have his own wife stand upon the platform, or his own daughter face the mob? Woman is the heart of man, but man is the head. Let woman go upon the platform, and she loses that shrinking modesty that gives her such power over children. What child would wish to have a public-speaking mother? I trust this evil will not creep in upon the church. I felt bound to resist it at the outset, and unless I am convinced of my error shall withstand it to the death." * * * *

January 2, 1877, Rev. Dr. See continued his defense of himself for letting a woman into his pulpit. Then the roll was called for the views of the Presbytery. Dr. McIllvaine said that the two sources of light, as he understood it, were the teachings of the Lord and his disciples. The Lord didn't select women for his twelve, and vacancies were not filled by women. It wasn't a woman who was chosen to do Paul's work. He was the chosen teacher of the church in that and all succeeding ages, and he had said, "I suffer not women to teach, or to usurp authority in the church." Dr. Brinsmade, who was the pastor of the Wickliffe Church before Dr. See was called there, admitted that women could preach well, but thought the Presbytery had better stick by the divine command. Dr. Canfield also agreed with Paul. He loved women and loved their work, but it seemed from the experience of the world that God intended that the pulpit should be the place for men. Such, at any rate, had been the principle and the practice of the Presbyterian Church; and if Brother See could not conform to its rules, he would say to him, "Go, brother; there are other churches in which you can find a place." Dr. Canfield was called to order for that addendum. Dr. Hutchings, of Orange, referred to the ancient justification of slavery from the Bible, and in view of honest differences of construction accepted by the church, thought the question should be left to the discretion of pastors and church-sessions. Rev. Jonathan F. Stearns, pastor of the First Church, demurred to this and stood by the Scripture text. Nine-tenths of the ladies of the church, he said, would vote against preaching by women.

Rev. James E. Wilson, pastor of the South Park Church, said that in churches where women had been permitted to preach, they had lost ground. "I have never heard a Quaker woman," said he, "preach a sermon worth three cents (laughter), and yet I have heard the spirit move them to get up and speak at most improper times and on most inopportune occasions, and have heard them say most improper and impertinent things." In the Methodist Church he did not believe that there were over twenty-five women preachers, so the women were losing ground, and not gaining. Even the woman suffragists, who made so much noise a few years ago, had subsided, and he did not believe there were a hundred agitators in the whole country now. "See," he said, "where Brother See's argument would carry him. Any woman that has the spirit upon her may speak, and so, by and by, two or three women may walk up into Brother See's pulpit and say, 'Come down; it's our turn now, we are moved by the spirit.' (Laughter). A woman's voice was against her preaching; a man's voice came out with a 'thud,' but a woman spoke soft and pleasing; however, here were the plain words of the text, and any man that could throw it overboard could throw over the doctrine of the atonement. If a mother should teach her son from the pulpit by preaching to him, thus disobeying the plain words of the apostle, she must not be surprised if her son went contrary to some other teaching of the apostle. But the fact was, the women did not desire to preach; otherwise they would have preached long ago. He rejoiced when that convention of temperance women assembled in Newark, but he could not help pitying their husbands and families away out in Chicago and elsewhere. (Laughter).

Rev. Ferd. Smith, the pastor of the Second Church, said the president of the Woman's Temperance Union had asked him if they could have the use of the church, and he had said "yes"; "and," said Dr. Smith, "I am glad that I did it, and I am sorry that I was not there to hear the address; and now, brethren, I am going to confess that I have sinned a little in this matter of women preaching. Two or three years ago I went and heard Miss Smiley preach. I had heard in the morning—I won't mention his name—one of the most distinguished men of the country preach a very able sermon—a very long one, too. [Laughter.] I had heard in the afternoon a doctor of divinity; I don't see him here now, but I have seen him, and I won't mention his name; and I heard Miss Smiley in the evening. It may be heresy to say it, but I do think I was more fed that evening than I had been by both the others; but I do not on that account say that it is good for women to go, as a regular thing, into the pulpit. If I had heard her a dozen times, I should not have been so much moved. Woman-preaching may do for a little time, but it won't do for a permanency. I heard at Old Orchard, at a temperance convention, the most beautiful argument I ever listened to, delivered with grace and modesty and power. The words fell like dew upon the heart, enriching it, and the speaker was Miss Willard; but for all this, brethren, I do not approve of women preaching. [Great laughter.] We must not, for the sake of a little good, sacrifice a great principle." Dr. Pollock of Lyons Farms wanted to shelter women, to prevent them from being talked about as ministers are and criticised as ministers are; it was for this that he would keep them out of the pulpit. Rev. Drs. Findley and Prentiss de Neuve were in favor of sustaining the charge. Rev. Dr. Haley contended that Brother See ought not to be condemned, because he had not offended against any law of the church. Drs. Seibert, Ballantine and Hopwood spoke in favor of sustaining the charge. A vote of 16 to 12 found Rev. Dr. See guilty of violating the Scriptures by allowing women to preach, and the case was appealed to the General Assembly.

The General Assembly adopted the following report on this case:

The Rev. Isaac W. See, pastor of the Wickliffe Church, Newark, N. J., was charged by Rev. Elijah R. Craven, D. D., with disobedience to the divinely enacted ordinance in reference to the public speaking and teaching of women in the churches as recorded in 1 Corinthians, xiv., 33–37, and in 1 Timothy, ii., 11–13, in that twice on a specified Sabbath, in the pulpit of his said church, at the usual time of public service, he did introduce a woman, whom he permitted and encouraged then and there publicly to preach and teach.

The Presbytery of Newark sustained the charge, and from its decision Mr. See appealed to the synod of New Jersey, which refused by a decided vote to sustain the appeal, expressing its judgment in a minute of which the following is a part:

In sustaining the Presbytery of Newark as against the appeal of the Rev. I. M. See, the synod holds that the passages of scripture referred to in the action of the Presbytery, do prohibit the fulfilling by women of the offices of public preachers in the regular assemblies of the church.

From this decision Mr. See has further appealed to the General Assembly, which, having thereupon proceeded to issue the appeal, and having fully heard the original parties and members of the inferior judicatory, decided that the said appeal from the synod of New Jersey be not sustained by the following vote: To sustain, 85. To sustain in part, 71. Not to sustain, 201.

From the following description by Mrs. Devereux Blake, we have conclusive evidence of woman's capacity to govern under most trying circumstances:

A certain little woman living in Jersey City has, from time to time, occupied a portion of public consideration; this is Mrs. Ericka C. Jones, for four years and a half warden of the Hudson county jail, probably the only woman in the world who holds such a position. Her history is briefly this: Some seven years ago her husband obtained the appointment of jailor at this institution, and moved to it with his bride. From the time of their incoming a marked improvement in the administration of the jail became apparent, which continued, when, after two years, Mr. Jones was stricken down with softening of the brain, which reduced him to a condition of idiocy for six months before his death. When at last this occurred, by unanimous vote of the board of freeholders the woman who had really performed the duties of jailor was appointed warden of Hudson county jail. All this has been a matter of report in the papers, as well as the attempt to oust her from the position, which was made last fall, when certain male politicians wanted the place for some friend and voter, and appealed to Attorney-General Vanetta, who gave an opinion adverse to the lady's claims. Resolutions on the subject were passed by various woman suffrage societies, and anxious to see the subject of so much dispute, and hear her story from her own lips, a party of ladies was made up to call upon her.

Hudson-county jail stands in the same inclosure with the court-house, a small, neatly-kept park, well shaded by fine trees, and being on very high ground commands a view over the North River and New York Bay. The building is a substantial one of stone, with nothing of the repulsive aspect of a jail about it. Asking for Mrs. Jones, we were at once shown into the office. We had expected to see a woman of middle age and somewhat stern aspect. Instead, we beheld a pretty, young person, apparently not more than twenty-five years old, with bright, black eyes, waving brown hair, good features and plump figure. She was very neatly dressed and pleasant in manner, making us cordially welcome. We were conducted into the parlor and at once begged her to tell us all about her case, which she did very clearly and concisely. When she was left a widow with two little children she had no idea that this place would be given her, but it was tendered to her by unanimous vote of the board of freeholders. At that time there were in jail three desperate criminals, Proctor, Demsing and Foley, bank robbers, and some persons feared that a woman could not hold them, but they were safely transferred at the proper time from the jail to the state-prison. "And," she added, with a bright smile, "I never have lost a prisoner, which is more than many men-jailors can say. Some of them tried to escape last fall, but I had warning in time, sent for the police, and the attempt was prevented."

"And do you think there is any danger of your being turned out?" "I don't know. I intend to remain in the place until the end of my term, if possible, since as long as the effort to dismiss me is based solely on the ground of my sex and not of my incompetency, it ought justly to be resisted." "But Attorney-General Vanetta gave

an adverse opinion as to the legality of your appointment?" "Yes, but ex-Attorney-General Robert Gilchrist, a very able lawyer, has given an opinion in my favor, while Mr. Lippincott, counsel of the board when I was appointed, also held that I was eligible for the place."

She then went on to tell us some of the petty persecutions and indirect measures which have been resorted to in order to induce her to resign, as her term of office will not expire for two years. When her husband was given the position, the allowance consisted of 40 cents a day for each prisoner, 50 cents for each sick person, 25 cents for every committal, and 12½ cents for every discharge. The daily allowance has been cut down from 40 to 25 cents, and all the other allowances have been entirely done away with. She is, therefore, at this moment running that jail on 25 cents a day for each prisoner. Out of this sum she must pay for all food, all salaries of assistant jailors, etc., all wages of servants, and even the furniture of the place. She is supplied with fuel and gas, but no stores of any description. She has also had other annoyances. The payment of money justly due has been opposed or delayed; and whereas her husband was required to give bond for only $5,000, she has been forced to give one for $10,000. She has also been troubled by the visits of persons representing themselves to be reporters of papers, who have wished to borrow money of her, and failing in this, have printed disagreeable articles about her. She has, of course, no salary whatever. "However, I do as well as I can with the money I receive," she said, with that pleasant smile. "And now would you like to see the jail?" * * * *

Ex-Attorney Gilchrist's opinion on her case is an able indorsement of her position. He says, in the first place, that as Attorney-General Vanetta's adverse view was not given officially, it is not binding on the Board of Freeholders, and then goes on to cite precedents. "Alice Stubbs, in 1787, was appointed overseer of the poor in the county of Stafford, England, and the Court of King's Bench sustained her in the office. A woman was appointed governor of the work-house at Chelmsford, England, and the court held it to be a good appointment. Lady Brangleton was appointed keeper of the Gate-House jail in London. Lady Russell was appointed keeper of the Castle of Dunnington. All these cases are reported in *Stranges R.*, as clearly establishing the right and duty of woman to hold office. The case of Ann, Countess of Pembroke, Dorsett and Montgomery, who was sheriff of Westmoreland, is very well known." The opinion winds up by saying: "The argument that a woman is incompetent to perform the duties of such an office is doubly answered—first, by the array of cases in which it is held that she is competent; second, by the resolution of the board when Mrs. Jones was appointed, that she had for a long time prior thereto actually kept the jail while her husband was jailor." How this whole matter would be simplified if women could vote and hold office, so that merit and not sex should be the only qualification for any place.—*New York Record, 1876.*

The following incident shows not only what physical training will do in giving a girl self-reliance in emergencies, but it shows the nice sense of humor that grows out of conscious power with which a girl can always take a presuming youth at disadvantage. No doubt Miss McCosh, as a student in Princeton, could as easily distance her compeers in science, philosophy and the languages, as she did the dude on the highway. Why not open the doors of that institution and let her make the experiment?

The distinguished president of Princeton College, Dr. McCosh, has two daughters who are great walkers. They are in the habit of going to Trenton and back, a distance of about twenty miles, where they do their shopping. One day a dude accosted Miss Bridget on the road, and said, in the usual manner: "Beg pardon, but may I walk with you?" She replied, "Certainly," and quickened her pace a little. After the first half-mile the masher began to gasp, and then, as she passed on with a smile, he sat down panting on a mile-stone, and mopped the perspiration from his brow.

At the sixteenth national convention, held in Washington, March, 1884, the State was well represented;* Mrs. Hanaford gave an address on "New Jersey as a Leader." In her letter to the convention, Mrs. Hussey wrote:

An old gentleman, Aaron Burr Harrison, a resident of East Orange, has just passed on to his long home, full of years—eighty-eight—and with a good record. He told me about his sister's voting in New Jersey, when he was a child—probably about 1807. The last time I took a petition for woman suffrage to him, he signed it willingly, and his daughter also.

February 12, 1884, a special committee of the New Jersey Assembly granted a hearing† on the petition of Mrs. Celia B. Whitehead, and 220 other citizens of Bloomfield, asking the restoration of woman's right to vote; fully one-half of the members of the Assembly were present. Mrs. Seagrove handed the committee an ancient printed copy of the original constitution of New Jersey, dated July 2, 1776. The name of James Seagrove, her husband's grandfather, is endorsed upon it in his own handwriting. In the suffrage clause of this document the words "all inhabitants" were substituted for those of "male freeholders" in the provincial charter. Hence the constitution of 1776 gave suffrage to women and men of color. Mrs. Seagrove made an appeal on behalf of the women of the State. Mr. Blackwell gave a résumé of the unconstitutional action of the legislature in its depriving women of their right to vote. Mrs. Hanaford, in answer to a question of the committee, claimed the right for women not only to vote but to hold office; and instanced from her own observation the need of women as police officers, and especially as matrons in the police stations. The result of these appeals may be seen in a paragraph from the Boston *Commonwealth*, a paper in hearty sympathy:

In the lower House of the New Jersey legislature a Democratic member recently moved that the word "male" be stricken from the constitution of the State. After some positive discussion a non-partisan vote of 27 to 24 defeated the motion. This occurrence, it is to be observed, is chronicled of one of the most conservative States in the Union. The arguments used on both sides were not new or remarkable. But the vote was very close. If such a measure could in so conservative a State be nearly carried, we can have reasonable hope of its favorable reception, in more radical sections. In New Jersey we did not expect success for the resolution proposed. The favorable votes really surprised us. We do not mistake the omen. Gradually the point of woman's responsibility is being conceded. The arbitrary lines now drawn politically and socially are without reason. Indeed, one of the members of the New Jersey Assembly called attention to the fact that to grant suffrage now would not be the conferring of a new gift on women, but only a restoration of rights exercised in colonial times.

---

* Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford, Miss Ellen Miles and Mrs. Jackson of Jersey City.

† Mrs. Theresa Walling Seagrove of Keyport, Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford of Jersey City and Henry B. Blackwell of Boston were the speakers.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XL.

OHIO.

The First Soldiers' Aid Society—Mrs. Mendenhall—Cincinnati Equal Rights Association, 1868—Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital—Hon. J. M. Ashley—State Society, 1869—Murat Halstead's Letter—Dayton Convention, 1870—Women Protest against Enfranchisement—Sarah Knowles Bolton—Statistics on Coëducation—Thomas Wentworth Higginson—Woman's Crusade, 1874—Miriam M. Cole—Ladies' Health Association—Professor Curtis—Hospital for Women and Children, 1879—Letter from J. D. Buck, M. D.—March, 1881, Degrees Conferred on Women—Toledo Association, 1869—Sarah Langdon Williams—*The Sunday Journal*—*The Ballot-Box*—Constitutional Convention—Judge Waite—Amendment Making Women Eligible to Office—Mr. Voris, Chairman Special Committee on Woman Suffrage—State Convention, 1873—Rev. Robert McCune—Centennial Celebration—Women Decline to Take Part—Correspondence—Newbury Association—Women Voting, 1871—Sophia Ober Allen—Annual Meeting, Painesville, 1885—State Society, Mrs. Frances M. Casement, President—Adelbert College.

EARLY in the year 1862, Cincinnati became a hospital for the army operations under General Grant and was soon filled with wounded heroes from Fort Donelson and Pittsburg Landing, and the women here, as in all other cities, were absorbed in hospital and sanitary work. To the women of Cleveland is justly due the honor of organizing the first soldiers' aid society, a meeting being called for this purpose five days after the fall of Fort Sumter. Through the influence of Mrs. Mendenhall were inaugurated the great sanitary fairs* there, and by her untiring energy and that of the ladies who labored with her, many of our brave soldiers were restored to health. Mrs. Annie L. Quinby writes:

In the autumn of 1867 Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony made a lecturing tour through Ohio and roused popular thought on the question of suffrage. March 28, 1868, the Cincinnati Equal Rights Association† was formed, auxiliary to the National Society, of which Lucretia Mott was president. April 7, 1869, Mrs. Ryder called the attention of the meeting

* Among those associated with Mrs. Mendenhall were Mrs. Calvin W. Starbuck, Mrs. W. Woods, Miss Elizabeth Morris, Miss Ellen Thomas, Mrs. Kendrick, sister to General Anderson, Mrs. Caldwell, Mrs. Annie Ryder, Mrs. Mary Graham, Mrs. Louisa Hill, Mrs. Hoadly.

† The officers of Cincinnati Equal Rights Society were: *President*, Mrs. H. A. Leavitt; *Vice-President*, Mr. J. B. Quinby; *Corresponding-Secretary*, Mrs. A. L. Ryder; *Recording-Secretary*, Mrs. L. H. Blangy; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Mary Moulton; *Executive Committee*, Mrs. J. B. Quinby, Mr. —— Hill, Mrs. A. L. Ryder, Mrs. Dr. Morrell, Mrs. Mary Moulton, Mrs. Mary Graham, Mrs. Annie Laurie Quinby, Mrs. L. H. Blangy and Mrs. Dr. Gibson.

Digitized by Google

to a resolution offered by Mr. Gordon in the State legislature, to amend the constitution so as to strike out the word male, proposing that at the October election, "in all precincts in the State, there shall be a separate poll, at which all white women over 21 years of age shall be permitted to vote, and if the votes cast be a majority of all the white women, the constitution shall be amended." Mrs. Ryder seemed to think the proposition a very fair one, or intended by the mover to give the women, if they wanted to vote, the opportunity of saying so on this amendment to the constitution. Mrs. Blangy also concurred in this view of the subject. Mrs. Quinby expressed her indignation at the proposition, saying she believed its passage by the legislature would be detrimental to the cause, both on account of its provisions and the mode of accomplishing the object of the resolution. As it stood, it could but fail, as women were not prepared for it at the present time, and the proposition was not that the majority of votes cast should settle the question, but that the number cast in favor of it should be a majority of all the women in the State 21 years of age. She therefore thought we should express our decided disapproval of this amendment. Mrs. Leavitt also declared her opposition to this resolution, believing it to have been offered for the sole purpose of stalling the woman suffrage movement for years to come. She thought this association should express its decided opposition to this resolution. Mrs. Butterwood and others followed in the same strain, and it was finally agreed unanimously that the corresponding secretary be instructed to write to the mover of the resolution, expressing disapprobation of some of the terms of the amendment, with the hope that it will not pass in the form offered, and politely requesting Mr. Gordon to define his position, as the resolution is susceptible of being construed both for and against equal rights.

At a meeting held April 21, 1869, delegates* were elected to attend the May anniversary of the American Equal Rights Association in New York. Mrs. Margaret V. Longley was placed on the executive committee of the National Association to represent Ohio. On her return from New York she joined with the Cincinnati Equal Rights Society in a call for a convention in Pike's Hall, September 15, 16, 1869, for the organization of an Ohio State Society.† Mrs. Longley presided; the audiences were large and enthusiastic;‡ the press of the city gave extended reports. Murat Halstead, editor of the Cincinnati *Commercial*, sent the following reply to his invitation:

---

* The delegates appointed were, Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Quinby, Mrs. Mary Graham, Mrs. Charles Graham, Mrs. Mary Moulton, Mrs. Dr. Morrel, Mrs. Blangy, Mrs M. V. Longley, Mr. and Mrs. A. G. W. Carter, and Mrs. Soula and daughter.

† The officers of the State Society were: *President*, Mrs. H. Tracy Cutler, M. D., Cleveland; *Vice-President*, Mrs. M. V. Longley; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. H. M. Downey, Xenia; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Miriam M. Cole, Sidney; *Treasurer*, Mrs. L. H. Crall, Cincinnati; *Warden*, Mr. J. B. Quinby, Cincinnati; *Business Committee*, A. J. Boyer, esq., Dayton; Elias Longley, esq., Cincinnati; Mrs. R. L. Segur, Toledo; Mrs. Morgan K. Warwick, Cleveland; Dr. M. T. Organ, Urbana; Mrs. E. D. Stewart, Springfield; Miss Rebecca S. Rice, Yellow Springs.

‡ The speakers at Pike's Hall were Susan B. Anthony, Mary A. Livermore, Lucy Stone, Henry B. Blackwell, Mrs. Dr. Chase, Miriam M. Cole, Mr. A. J. Boyer, Dr. Mary Walker, J. J. Bellville, Mary B. Hall, Mrs. Dr. Keckeler, Mrs. Longley, Mrs. Graham, Mrs. Griffin, and Elizabeth Boynton.

CINCINNATI, July 28, 1869.

MRS. M. V. LONGLEY: *Dear Madam*—I cannot sign your call for a woman suffrage convention, for I do not feel a serious interest in the subject. That there are woman's wrongs that the law-makers should right, I believe. For instance, I think married women should hold property independently; that they should be able to save and enjoy the fruits of their own industry; and that they should not be absolutely in the power of lazy, dissipated or worthless husbands. But I cannot see clearly how the possession of the ballot would help women in the reform indicated. If, however, a majority of the women of Ohio should signify by means proving their active interest in the subject that they wanted to acquire the right of suffrage, I don't think I would offer opposition. M. HALSTEAD.

Mrs. Livermore and Miss Anthony made some amusing strictures on Mr. Halstead's letter, which called out laughter and cheers from the audience. April 27 and 28, 1870, a mass-meeting was held in Dayton. Describing the occasion, Miss Sallie Joy, in a letter to a Boston paper, says:

The west is evidently wide awake on the suffrage question. The people are working with zeal almost unknown in the East, except to the more immediately interested, who are making a life-labor of the cause. The two days' convention at Dayton was freighted with interest. Earnest women were there from all parts of the State. They of the west do not think much of distances, and consequently nearly every town of note was represented. Cleveland sent her women from the borders of the lake; Cincinnati sent hers from the banks of the Ohio; Columbus, Springfield, Toledo and Sydney were represented. Not merely the leaders were there, but those who were comparatively new to the cause; all in earnest,—young girls in the first flush of youth, a new light dawning on their lives and shining through their eyes, waiting, reaching longing hands for this new gift to womanhood,—mothers on the down-hill side of life, quietly but gladly expectant of the good that was coming so surely to crown all these human lives. Most of the speakers were western women—Mrs. Cutler, Mrs. Cole, Mrs. Stewart, of Ohio, and Miss Boynton, of Indiana. The East sent our own Susan B. Anthony, and Mrs. Livermore of Boston. Like every other convention, it grew more interesting the longer it continued, and just when the speakers were so tired that they were glad the work for the time was done, the listeners, like a whole army of Oliver Twists, were crying for more. They are likely to have more—a great deal more—before the work is done completely, for it is evident the leaders don't intend to let the thing rest where it is, but to push it forward to final success. From the list of resolutions considered and adopted, I send the following:

Resolved, That as the Democratic party has long since abolished the political aristocracy of wealth; and the Republican party has now abolished the aristocracy of race; so the true spirit of Republican Democracy of the present, demands the abolition of the political aristocracy of sex.

Resolved, That as the government of the United States has, by the adoption of the fifteenth amendment, admitted the theory that one man cannot define the rights and duties of another man, so we demand the adoption of a sixteenth amendment on the same principle, that one sex cannot define the rights and duties of another sex.

Resolved, That we rejoice in the noble action of the men of Wyoming, by which the right of suffrage has been granted to the women of that territory.

Resolved, That we feel justly proud of the action of those representatives of the General Assembly of Ohio, who have endeavored to secure an amendment to the State constitution, striking out the word "male" from that instrument.

It is rather remarkable that in a State which so early established two colleges admitting women—Oberlin in 1834, and Antioch in 1853—any intelligent women should have been found at so late a date as April 15, 1870, to protest against the right of

Digitized by Google

self-government for themselves, yet such is the case, as the following protest shows:

We acknowledge no inferiority to men. We claim to have no less ability to perform the duties which God has imposed upon us than they have to perform those imposed upon them. We believe that God has wisely and well adapted each sex to the proper performance of the duties of each. We believe our trusts to be as important and as sacred as any that exist on earth. We feel that our present duties fill up the whole measure of our time and abilities; and that they are such as none but ourselves can perform. Their importance requires us to protest against all efforts to compel us to assume those obligations which cannot be separated from suffrage; but which cannot be performed by us without the sacrifice of the highest interests of our families and of society. It is our fathers, brothers, husbands and sons, who represent us at the ballot-box. Our fathers and brothers love us. Our husbands are our choice, and one with us. Our sons are what *we* make them. We are content that they represent us in the corn-field, the battle-field, at the ballot-box and the jury-box, and we them, in the church, the school-room, at the fireside and at the cradle; believing our representation, even at the ballot-box, to be thus more full and impartial than it could possibly be, were all women allowed to vote. We do, therefore respectively protest against legislation to establish woman suffrage in Ohio.

The above paper, signed by more than one hundred ladies of Lorain county, was presented, March 14, 1870, to the legislature assembled at Columbus. Mrs. Sarah Knowles Bolton, criticising the Oberlin protestants, said:

That so many signed is not strange, because the non-suffrage side is the popular one at present. Years hence, when it shall be customary for women to vote, it is questionable whether the lady who drew up that document would have many supporters.

If "we are not inferior to men," we must have as clear opinions and as good judgment as they. To say, then, that we are not capable of judging of political questions, is untrue. To say that we are not interested in such things is absurd, for who can be more anxious for good laws and good law-makers than women, who, for the most part, have sons and daughters in this whirlpool of temptation, called social and business life. If we are too ignorant to have an opinion, the fault lies at our own door.

These ladies reason upon the premises that the duties imposed upon us as we find them in this nineteenth century, are the duties, conditions, and relations established of God. Two things we do certainly find in the Bible with regard to this matter; that women are to bear children, and men to earn bread. The first duty we believe has been confined entirely to the female sex, but the male sex have not kept the other in all cases. If anybody has belonged for any considerable time to a benevolent institution, he has ascertained that women sometimes are obliged to earn bread and bear children also. A century or two ago, when women seldom thought of writing books, or being physicians or lawyers, professors or teachers, or doing anything but housework, probably they thought, as the ladies of Lorain county do to-day, they were in the blessed noonday of woman's enlightenment and happiness. Their husbands, very likely, needed something of the same companionship as the men of the present, but it was unpopular for girls to attend school. If these ladies, after careful study and thought, believe that woman suffrage will work evil in the land, they ought to say that, rather than base it upon lack of time. The enfranchisement of 15,000,000 women will be a balance of power for good or evil that will need looking after. As for our representing men at the fireside, I think it a great deal pleasanter that they be there in person. Nothing is more blessed than the home circle, and here I think if husbands were not so often represented by their wives, while they are absent evening after evening on "important business," the condition of things would be improved. If the ladies aforesaid cannot vote without the highest interests of their families being sacrificed, they ought to be allowed to remain in peace. I am glad they made this protest, not only

because this is a country where honest views ought to be expressed, but because agitation pushes forward reform. I am glad that nearly half of our representatives were in favor of submitting this question to the women of the State, and that our interests were so ably defended by a talented representative from our own district. I do not think, however, by submitting it to the women, they would get a correct expression upon the subject. A good many would vote for suffrage, a few against it, and thousands would be afraid to vote. If it is granted, I do not suppose all women will vote immediately. Many prejudices will first have to give way. If women vote what they wish to vote, and there is no disorderly conduct at the polls in consequence, and no general disorder in the body politic, I do not see any objection to the voting being continued from year to year.

When women like Miss Jones of our city, now in California, take a few more professorships in a university over half-a-hundred competitors, write a few more libraries, show themselves capable of solving great questions, become ornaments to their professions, it will seem more absurd for them not to be enfranchised than it does now for them to be so.

Hon. J. M. Ashley, of Toledo, in a speech on the floor of congress, June 1, 1868, said:

I want citizenship and suffrage to be synonymous. To put the question beyond the power of States to withhold it, I propose the amendment to article fourteen, now submitted. A large number of Republicans who concede that the qualifications of an elector ought to be the same in every State, and that it is more properly a national than a State question, do not believe congress has the power under our present constitution to enact a law conferring suffrage in the States, nevertheless they are ready and willing to vote for such an amendment to the constitution as shall make citizenship and suffrage uniform throughout the nation. For this purpose I have added to the proposed amendment for the election of president a section on suffrage, to which I invite special attention.

This is the third or fourth time I have brought forward a proposition on suffrage substantially like the one just presented to the House. I do so again because I believe the question of citizenship suffrage one which ought to be met and settled now. Important and all-absorbing as many questions are which now press themselves upon our consideration, to me no one is so vitally important as this. Tariffs, taxation, and finance ought not to be permitted to supersede a question affecting the peace and personal security of every citizen, and, I may add, the peace and security of the nation. No party can be justified in withholding the ballot from any citizen of mature years, native or foreign born, except such as are *non compos* or are guilty of infamous crimes; nor can they justly confer this great privilege upon one class of citizens to the exclusion of another class.

The *Revolution* of March 19, 1868, said:

Notwithstanding the most determined hostility to the demands of the age for female physicians, institutions for their educational preparation for professional responsibilities are rapidly increasing. The ball first began to move in the United States,* and now a female medical college is in successful operation in London, where the favored monopolizers of physic and surgery were resolved to keep out all new ideas in their line by acts of parliament. But the ice-walls of opposition have melted away, and even in Russia a woman has graduated with high medical honors.

---

* At a meeting of the corporators of the Cleveland Homeopathic Medical College and Hospital for Women, the following board of trustees was appointed: Stillman Witt, T. S. Beckwith, Bolivar Butts, N. Schneider, M. D., T. S. Lindsey, Mrs. D. R. Tilden, Mrs. S. F. Lester, Mrs. Peter Thatcher, Mrs. C. A. Seaman, M. D., Mrs. M. K. Merrick, M. D., Mrs. S. D. McMillan, Mrs. M. B. Ambler, Mrs. Lemuel Crawford, Mrs. Henry Chisholm, Mrs. G. B. Bowers. At a subsequent meeting of the board of trustees, the following officers were chosen: *President*, Mrs. C. A. Seaman, M. D.; *Vice-President*, Mrs. S. F. Lester; *Secretary*, Mrs. M. B. Ambler; *Treasurer*, Mrs. S. D. McMillan.

Digitized by Google

The following statistics from Thomas Wentworth Higginson settle many popular objections to a collegiate education for women:

GRADUATES OF ANTIOCH COLLEGE.—In a paper read before the Social Science Association in the spring of 1874 I pointed out the presumption to be, that if a desire for knowledge was implanted in the minds of women, they had also as a class the physical capacity to gratify it; and that therefore the burden of proof lay on those who opposed such education, on physiological grounds, to collect facts in support of their position. In criticising Dr. Clarke's book, "Sex in Education," I called attention to the fact that he has made no attempt to do this, but has merely given a few detached cases, whose scientific value is impaired by the absence of all proof whether they stand for few or many. We need many facts and a cautious induction; not merely a few facts and a sweeping induction. I am now glad to put on record a tabular view * of the graduates of Antioch, with special reference to their physical health and condition; the facts being collected and mainly arranged by Professor J. B. Weston of Antioch—who has been connected with that institution from its foundation—with the aid of Mrs. Weston and Rev. Olympia Brown, both graduates of the college. For the present form of the table, however, I alone am responsible.

It appears that of the 41 graduates, ranging from the year 1857 to 1873, no fewer than 36 are now living. Of these the health of 11 is reported as "very good"; 19

*

Individual.	Year of Graduation.	Married or Single.	Number of Children.	Health.	Remarks.
1	1857	Married	3	Not living	Died, 1874.
2	"	"	1	Good	Taught eleven years; now in Indiana.
3	"	"	2	"	Has taught ever since graduating; now in Ohio.
4	1858	"	2	Very good	Taught five years; now in Ohio.
5	"	"	6	Good	Has taught school; slight bronchial trouble.
6	1859	"	3	"	
7	"	"	3	Uncertain	Has taught school.
8	"	"		Good	Taught thirteen years, till married, in 1872.
9	"	"	2 or 3	"	No recent intelligence; health good so far as known.
10	1860	Single		"	Taught some years; now in England.
11	"	Married	2	"	Taught three years.
12	"	Single		"	Has taught school.
13	"	"		Very good	Physician in Missouri.
14	"	Married	1	" "	Has taught school.
15	"	Single		" "	Constantly a teacher, except two years in Europe.
16	"	Married		" "	Minister in Connecticut; lately married.
17	1861	"		Good	Taught three years; journalist in Ohio.
18	"	"	1		Has taught school.
19	1862	"	1	Not living	Died of hereditary consumption.
20	"	"	1	" "	
21	"	"	1	Good	
22	"	"	2	Very good	Resides in Ohio.
23	"	"	2	" "	Resides tn Vermont.
24	"	"	2	" "	Resides in New York.
25	"	"		Good	Lately married.
26	"	"	3	"	Has taught school.
27	1863	"	2	Very good	Taught four years, till married.
28	1864	"	3	" "	Taught one year.
29	1866	"		Not good	Troubled with scrofula, dating back earlier than her school days; practices medicine in Missouri.
30	1868	Single		Very good	Has just returned from three years in Europe, where she took long pedestrian journeys.
31	"	Married	1	Good	Has taught school and is teaching now.
32	"	"	2	"	Taught three years.
33	1869	Single		"	Taught constantly and is teaching now.
34	1870	Married		Not living	Died, 1871.
35	"	"	1	Good	Has taught school in Missouri.
36	"	"	1	"	Taught one year.
37	1871	Single		Unknown	Came to college in delicate health, which improved while there; the youngest woman ever graduated at Antioch.
38	1872	"		Not living	Died, 1873, of hereditary consumption.
39	"	"		Fair	Teaching in Massachusetts.
40	1873	"		Good	
41	"	"		"	

"good"; making 30 in all; 1 is reported as "fair"; 1 "uncertain"; 1 "not good," and 3 "unknown." Of the 41 graduates, 30 are reported as married and 11 are single, five of these last having graduated within three years. Of the 30 married, 24 have children, numbering 48 or 49 in all. Of the 6 childless, 3 are reported as very recently married; one died a few months after marriage, and the facts in the other cases are not given. Thirty-four of the forty-one have taught since graduated, and I agree with Professor Weston that teaching is as severe a draft on the constitution as study. Taking these facts as a whole, I do not see how the most earnest advocate of higher education could ask for a more encouraging exhibit; and I submit the case without argument, so far as this pioneer experiment at coëducation is concerned. If any man seriously believes that his non-collegiate relatives are in better physical condition than this table shows, I advise him to question forty-one of them and tabulate the statistics obtained.

In the following editorial in the *Woman's Journal* Mr. Higginson pursues the opposition still more closely, and answers their frivolous objections:

I am surprised to find that Professor W. S. Tyler of Amherst College, in his paper on "The Higher Education of Woman," in *Scribner's Monthly* for February, repeats the unfair statements of President Eliot of Harvard, in regard to Oberlin College. The fallacy and incorrectness of those statements were pointed out on the spot by several, and were afterwards thoroughly shown by President Fairchild of Oberlin; yet Professor Tyler repeats them all. He asserts that there has been a great falling off in the number of students in that college; he entirely ignores the important fact of the great multiplication of colleges which admit women; and he implies, if he does not assert, that the separate ladies' course at Oberlin has risen as a substitute for the regular college course. His words are these, the italics being my own:

In Oberlin, where the experiment has been tried under the most favorable circumstances, it has proved a failure so far as the regular college course is concerned. The number of young women in that course, instead of increasing with the prosperity of the institution, *has diminished, so that it now averages only two or three to a class.* The rest pursue a different curriculum, live in a separate dormitory, and study by themselves in a course of their own, reciting, indeed, with the young men, and by way of reciprocity and in true womanly compassion, allowing some of them to sit at their table in the dining-hall, but yet constituting substantially a female seminary, or, if you please, a woman's college in the university.—*Scribner, February, page 457.*

Now, it was distinctly stated by President Fairchild last summer, that this "different curriculum" was the course originally marked out for women, and that the regular college course was an after-thought. This disposes of the latter part of Professor Tyler's statement. I revert, therefore, to his main statement, that "the number of young women in the collegiate course has diminished, so that it now averages only two or three to a class." Any reader would suppose his meaning to be that taking one year with another, and comparing later years with the early years of Oberlin, there has been a diminution of women. What is the fact? The Oberlin College triennial catalogue of 1872 lies before me, and I have taken the pains to count and tabulate the women graduated in different years, during the thirty-two years after 1841, when they began to be graduated there. Dividing them into decennial periods, I find the numbers to be as follows: 1841–1850, thirty-two women were graduated; 1851–1860, seventeen women were graduated; 1861–1870, forty women were graduated. From this it appears that during the third decennial period there was not only no diminution, but actually a higher average than before. During the first period the classes averaged 3.2 women; during the second period 1.7 women, and during the third period 4 women. Or if, to complete the exhibit, we take in the two odd classes at the end, and make the third period consist of twelve classes, the average will still be 3.8, and will be larger than either of the previous periods. Or if, disregarding the even distribution of periods, we take simply the last ten years, the average will be 3.1. More-

Digitized by Google

over, during the first period there was one class (1842) which contained no women at all; and during the second period there were three such classes (1852–3, 7); while during the third period every class has had at least one woman.

It certainly would not have been at all strange if there had been a great falling off in the number of graduates of Oberlin. At the outset it had the field to itself. Now the census gives fifty-five "colleges" for women, besides seventy-seven which admit both sexes. Many of these are inferior to Oberlin, no doubt, but some rose rapidly to a prestige far beyond this pioneer institution. With Cornell University on the one side, and the University of Michigan on the other—to say nothing of minor institutions—the wonder is that Oberlin could have held its own at all. Yet the largest class of women it ever graduated (thirteen) was so late as 1865, and if the classes since then "average but two or three," so did the classes for several years before that date. Professor Tyler knows very well that classes fluctuate in every college, and that a decennial period is the least by which the working of any system can be tested. Tried by this test, the alleged diminution assumes a very different aspect. If, however, there were a great decline at Oberlin, it would simply show a transfer of students to other colleges, since neither Professor Tyler nor President Eliot will deny that the total statistics of colleges show a rapid increase in the number of women.

Moreover, I confess that my confidence in Professor Tyler's sense of accuracy is greatly impaired by these assertions about Oberlin, and also by his statement, which I must call reckless, at least, in regard to the inferiority in truth, purity and virtue of those women who seek the suffrage. He asserts (page 456) that "women—women generally—the truest, purest and best of the sex—do not wish for the right of suffrage." Now, if the women who oppose suffrage are truest, purest and best, the women who advocate it must plainly be inferior at all these points; and that is an assertion which not only these women themselves, but their brothers, husbands and sons are certainly entitled to resent. Mr. Tyler has a perfect right to argue for his own views, for or against suffrage, but he has no right to copy the Oriental imprecation, and say to his opponents, "May the grave of your mother be defiled!" He claims that he holds official relations to one "woman's college," one "female seminary" and one "young ladies' institute." Will it conduce to the moral training of those who enter those institutions that their officers set them the example of impugning the purity and virtue of those who differ in opinion from themselves?

But supposing Professor Tyler not to be bound by the usual bonds of courtesy or of justice, he is at least bound by the consistency of his own position. Thus, he goes out of his way to compliment Mrs. Somerville and Miss Mitchell. Both these ladies are identified with the claim for suffrage. He lauds "Uncle Tom's Cabin," but Mrs. Stowe has written almost as ably for the enfranchisement of woman as for the freedom of the blacks. He praises the "sacramental host of authoresses," who, he says, "will move on with ever-growing power, overthrowing oppression, restraining vice and crime, reforming morals and manners, purifying public sentiment, revolutionizing business, society and government, till every yoke is broken and all nations are won to the truth." But it has been again and again shown that the authoresses of America are, with but two or three exceptions, in favor of woman suffrage, and, therefore, instead of being "sacramental," do not even belong to Professor Tyler's class of "wisest, truest and best." He thus selects for compliment on one page the very women whom he has traduced on another. His own witnesses testify against him. It is a pity that such phrases of discourtesy and unfairness should disfigure an essay which in many respects says good words for women, recommends that they should study Greek, and says, in closing, that their elevation "is at once the measure and the means of the elevation of mankind."

In the autumn of 1884 an effort was made to exclude women from Adelbert College. We give an account thereof from the pen of Mrs. Sarah Knowles Bolton, published in the *English Woman's Review* of January, 1885:

DEAR EDITOR: The city of Cleveland has been stirred for weeks on this question of woman's higher education. Western Reserve College, founded in 1826, at Hudson, was moved to Cleveland in 1874, because of a gift of $100,000 from Mr. Amasa Stone, with the change of name to Adelbert College, in memory of an only son. A few young women had been students since 1873. In Cleveland, about twenty young ladies availed themselves of such admirable home privileges. Their scholarship was excellent—higher than that of the young men. They were absent from exercises only half as much as the men. Their conduct was above reproach. A short time since the faculty, except the president, Dr. Carroll Cutler, petitioned the board of trustees to discontinue coëducation at the college, for the assumed reasons that girls require different training from boys, never "identical" education; that it is trying to their health to recite before young men; "the strain upon the nervous system from mortifying mistakes and serious corrections is to many young ladies a cruel additional burden laid upon them in the course of study"; "that the provision we offer to girls is not the best, and is even dangerous"; that "where women are admitted, the college becomes second or third-rate, and that, worst of all, young men will be deterred from coming to this college by the presence of ladies." An "annex" was recommended, not with college degrees, but a subordinate arrangement with "diploma examinations, so far and so fast as the resources of the college shall allow."

As soon as the subject became known, the newspapers of the city took up the question. As the public furnishes the means and the students for every college, the public were vitally interested. Ministers preached about it, and they, with doctors and lawyers, wrote strong articles, showing that no "annex" was desired; that parents wished thorough, high, self-reliant education for their daughters as for their sons; that health was not injured by the embarrassment (?) of reciting before young men; that young men had not been deterred from going to Ann Arbor, Oberlin, Cornell, and other institutions where there are young women; that it was unjust to make girls go hundreds of miles away to Vassar or Smith or Wellesley, when boys were provided with the best education at their very doors; that, with over half the colleges of this country admitting women, with the colleges of Italy, Switzerland, Sweden, Holland and France throwing open their doors to women, for Adelbert College to shut them out, would be a step backward in civilization.

The women of the city took up the matter, and several thousands of our best names were obtained to a petition, asking that girls be retained members of the college; judges and leading persons gladly signed. The trustees met November 7, 1884. The whole city eagerly waited the result. The chairman of the committee, Hon. I. W. Chamberlain of Columbus, who had been opposed to coëducation at first, from the favorable reports received by him from colleges all over the country, had become a thorough convert, and the report was able and convincing.

President Angell of Michigan University, where there are 1,500 students, wrote: "Women were admitted here under the pressure of public sentiment against the wishes of most of the professors. But I think no professor now regrets it, or would favor the exclusion of women. We made no solitary modification of our rules or requirements. The women did not become hoydenish; they did not fail in their studies; they did not break down in health; they have been graduated in all departments; they have not been inferior in scholarship to the men. We count the experiment here successful."

Galusha Anderson, president of Chicago University, wrote: "Our only law here is that the students shall act as gentlemen and ladies. They mingle freely together, just as they do in society, as I think God intended that they should, and the effect in all respects is good. I have never had the slightest trouble from the association of the sexes."

Chancellor Manatt of Nebraska University, for four years engaged in university work at Yale, in answer to the questions as to whether boys would be driven away from the institution, replied: "This question sounds like a joke in this longitude. As

well say a girl's being born into a family turns the boys out of doors. It rather strengthens the home attraction. So in the university. I believe there is not a professor or student here who would not, for good and solid reasons, fight for the system."

President Warren of Boston University, lately the recipient of £200,000, wrote: "The only opponents of coëducation I have ever known are persons who know nothing about it practically, and whose difficulties are all speculative and imaginary. Men are more manly and women more womanly when concerted in a wholly human society than when educated in a half-human one."

President White of Cornell wrote: "I regard the 'annex' for women in our colleges as a mere make-shift and step in the progress toward the full admission of women to all college classes, and I think that this is a very general view among men who have given unprejudiced thought to the subject. Having now gone through one more year, making twelve in all since women were admitted, I do not hesitate to say that I believe their presence here is good for us in every respect."

Professor Moses Coit Tyler of Cornell said: "My observation has been that under the joint system the tone of college life has grown more earnest, more courteous and refined, less flippant and cynical. The women are usually among the very best scholars, and lead instead of drag, and their lapses from good health are rather, yes, decidedly, less numerous than those alleged by the men. There is a sort of young man who thinks it not quite the thing, you know, to be in a college where women are; and he goes away, if he can, and I am glad to have him do so. The vacuum he causes is not a large one, and his departure is more than made up by the arrival in his stead of a more robust and manlier sort."

The only objectors to coëducation were from those colleges which had never tried it; President Porter of Yale thought it a suitable method for post-graduate classes, and President Seeley for a course of "lower grade" than Amherst.

President Cutler of Adelbert College made an able report, showing that the progress of the age is towards coëducation. Only fifty-three Protestant colleges, founded since 1830, exclude women; while 156 coëducational institutions have been established since that date.

Some of the trustees thought it desirable to imitate Yale,* and others felt that *they* knew what studies are desirable for woman better than she knew herself! When the vote was taken, to their honor be it said, it was twelve to six, or two to one, in favor of coëducation. The girls celebrated this just and manly decision by a banquet.

The inauguration of the women's crusade at this time (1874) in Ohio created immense excitement, not only throughout that State, but it was the topic for the pulpit and the press all over the nation. Those identified with the woman suffrage movement, while deeply interested in the question of temperance, had no sympathy with what they felt to be a desecration of womanhood and of the religious element in woman. They felt that the fitting place for petitions and appeals was in the halls of legislation, to senators and congressmen, rather than rumsellers and drunkards in the dens of vice and the public thoroughfares. It was pitiful to see the faith of women in God's power to effect impossibilities. Like produces like in the universe of matter and

* But even old Yale has to succumb to the on-sweeping tide of equal chances to women, as will be seen by the following Associated Press item in the New York *Sun* of October 2, 1885: "NEW HAVEN, Conn., Oct. 1.—Miss Alice B. Jordin, of Coldwater, Mich., a graduate of the academic and law departments of the University of Michigan, entered the Yale law school to-day. She is the first woman ever entered in any department of Yale outside of the art school.

mind, and so long as women consent to make licentious, drunken men the fathers of their children, no power in earth or heaven can save the race from these twin vices. The following letter from Miriam M. Cole makes some good points on this question:

If the "woman's war against whisky" had been inaugurated by the woman suffrage party, its aspect, in the eyes of newspapers, would be different from what it now is. If Lucy Stone had set the movement on foot, it would have been so characteristic of her! What more could one expect from such a disturber of public peace? She, who has no instinctive scruples against miscellaneous crowds at the polls, might be expected to visit saloons and piously serenade their owners, until patience ceases to be a virtue. But for women who are so pressed with domestic cares that they have no time to vote; for women who shun notoriety so much that they are unwilling to ask permission to vote; for women who believe that men are quite capable of managing State and municipal affairs without their interference; for them to have set on foot the present crusade, how queer! Their singing, though charged with a moral purpose, and their prayers, though directed to a specific end, do not make their warfare a whit more feminine, nor their situation more attractive. A woman knocking out the head of a whisky barrel with an ax, to the tune of Old Hundred, is not the ideal woman sitting on a sofa, dining on strawberries and cream, and sweetly warbling, "The Rose that All are Praising." She is as far from it as Susan B. Anthony was when pushing her ballot into the box. And all the difference between the musical saint spilling the precious liquid and the unmusical saint offering her vote is, that the latter tried to kill several birds with one stone, and the former aims at only one.

Intemperance, great a curse as it is, is not the only evil whose effects bear most heavily on women. Wrong is hydra-headed, and to work so hard to cut off one head, when there is a way by which all may be dissevered, is not a far-sighted movement; and when you add to this the fact that the head is not really cut off, but only dazed by unexpected melodies and supplications, there is little satisfaction in the effort. We learn that, outside of town corporations that have been lately "rectified," the liquor traffic still goes on, and the war is to be carried into the suburbs. What then? Where next? Which party can play this game the longer? Tears, prayers and songs will soon lose their novelty—this spasmodic effort will be likely soon to spend itself; is there any permanent good being wrought? Liquor traffic opposes woman suffrage, and with good reasons. It knows that votes change laws, and it also knows that the votes of women would change the present temperance laws and make them worth the paper on which they are printed. While this uprising of women is a hopeful sign, yet it cannot make one law black or white. It may, for a time, mold public opinion, but depraved passions and appetites need wholesome laws to restrain them. If women would only see this and demand the exercise of their right of suffrage with half the zeal and unanimity with which they storm a man's castle, it would be granted. This is the only ax to lay at the root of the tree.

Springfield, Ohio, has just had a case in a Justice Court which attracted much attention and awakened much interest. A woman whose husband had reduced his family to utter want by drunkenness, entered a suit against the rumseller. An appeal from the drunkard's wife to the ladies of Springfield had been circulated in the daily papers, which so aroused them that a large delegation of the most respectable and pious women of the city came into the court. But the case was adjourned for a week. During this time the excitement had become so great that when the trial came on the court-room was full of spectators, and the number of ladies within the rail was increased three-fold. Mrs. E. D. Stewart made the plea to the jury. A verdict was rendered against the rumseller. An appeal will be taken; but the citizens of Springfield will never forget the influence which the presence of women, in sympathy with another wronged woman, had upon the court. And what added power those women

Digitized by Google

would have had as judges, jurors and advocates; citizens crowned with all the rights, privileges and immunities justly theirs by law and constitution.

Of the work in Geauga county, Mrs. Sophia Ober Allen, of South Newbury writes:

In the winter of 1851-2, Anson Read circulated a petition praying the legislature to protect married women in their property rights; and from that time the subject of women's rights was frequently discussed in social and literary gatherings. In 1871, Mrs. Lima Ober proposed to be one of six women to go to the township election and offer her vote. Nine * joined her, but all their votes were rejected, the judges saying they feared trouble would be the result if they received them. From that year to 1876 these heroic women of South Newbury persisted in offering their votes at the town, state and presidential elections; and though always refused, they would repair to another room with the few noble men who sustained them, and there duly cast their ballots for justice and equality. On one occasion they polled fifty votes—thirty-one women and nineteen men. In 1876 they adopted a series of stirring resolutions with a patriotic declaration of principles.

In 1873, large meetings were held, and a memorial sent to the constitutional convention, asking for an amendment, that "the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged to any adult citizen except for crime, idiocy or lunacy." On January 12, 1874, a political club was organized,† which has been active in holding meetings and picnics, circulating petitions and tracts. On July 4, 1874, a basket picnic was held in Ober and Allen's grove, at which Gen. A. C. Voris was among the speakers.‡ Hon. A. G. Riddle, whose early life was spent mostly in Newbury, encouraged and assisted the work, both by voice and pen. During the winter of 1878, Susan B. Anthony, in company with my husband and myself, lectured in several towns under the auspices of the club. Miss Eva L. Pinney, a native of Newbury, was employed by the club to canvass the county. Her success was marked. In 1879 the treasury received a bequest of $50, from Reuben H. Ober, who, though spending much of his time in the East, ever sustained a live interest in the home society.§

---

* Mesdames Lima H. Ober, Lovina Greene, Hophni Smith, Ruth F. Munn, Perleyette M. Burnett, Sophia L. O. Allen, Mary Hodges, Lydia Smith, Sarah A. Knox. The men who sustained and voted with these women were Deacon Amplias Greene, Darius M. Allen, Ransom Knox, Apollos D. Greene, Wesley Brown. Their tickets were different each year; their first read, "Our Motto—Equal Rights for all—Taxation without Representation is Tyranny. Our Foes—Tradition and Superstition." Among the speakers invited to address the people at the polls were Mrs. Organ, of Yellow Springs, and Mrs. Hope Whipple, of Clyde.

† *President*, Ruth F. Munn; *Vice-Presidents*, Joel Walker, D M. Allen; *Recording Secretary*, Ellen Munn; *Corresponding Secretary*, Julia P. Greene; *Treasurer*, Mary Hodges; *Executive Committee*, William Munn, Sophia L. O. Allen, Amanda M. Greene, Apollos D. Greene, Ransom Knox.

‡ At other picnics the speakers were, Mrs. S. B. Chase, M. D., Colonel S. D. Harris, J. W. Tyler Jane O. DeForrest, T. W. Porter.

§ The Society of South Newbury, like that of Toledo, refrained from auxiliaryship with the State Association from the time of its organization to June, 1885, when such relationship was made possible by the State Society voting itself an independent organization, free to coöperate with all national or local associations that have for their object the enfranchisement of women; and to Mrs. Allen may be ascribed a large share of the credit for the good work and broad platform of the South Newbury club.

Digitized by Google

Mrs. Sarah Langdon Williams sends us the following report from the Toledo society:

In the winter of 1869, Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony returning from an extended trip through the West, spent a few days in Toledo. In addition to public meetings, their coming was the occasion for many pleasant and hospitable gatherings. A large circle of intelligent and earnest women were longing and waiting to do something to speed the movement for woman suffrage, when the coming of these pioneers of reform roused them to action. It was like the match to the fire all ready for kindling, and an organization was speedily effected.* From that time forward, the air seemed magnetized with reform ideas, and to the loyal band who stood true to their flag, new members were added from time to time, and from this little band went forth an influence, a steady force which has operated silently though continuously through both visible and invisible channels, moulding the thought and action of the community. The meetings of this association were regularly reported by the daily press, with more or less justice, according as the reporter present, or the newspaper which reported the proceedings, was more or less friendly.

A letter published in *The Revolution* of June 10, 1869, indicates the practical work of our association:

The first skirmish along the line of the suffrage army in Ohio has been fought, and the friends of reformation may well rejoice at the result. In this city there has existed for a long time a library association to which women were admitted as members, but in the control or management of which they had no voice. Under the pressure of influences set in motion by your visit, it was resolved that this relic of the past should be swept away, that women should be represented in the management as well as in the membership of the association. At the late election six directors were to be chosen among other officers, and Miss Anna C. Mott,† Mrs. M. W. Bond and Mrs. M. J. Barker were candidates upon a ticket called the Equal Rights Ticket, headed by Mr. A. W. Gleason, for president. The dangerous proposition, not only of allowing women to vote, but of giving them offices, was a bombshell in the camp of conservatism, and every influence that could be, was brought to bear against this ticket. After an exciting contest, the result showed that notwithstanding a powerful and influential opposition, the ticket was elected by a vote of from 186 to 220 out of 327 votes. This result has been all the more grateful, because in the opposition were to be found many of the most wealthy and respected citizens of Toledo.

As an index of the interest the women manifested in that election, three-fourths of them voted. It was interesting to notice the firmness with which the women walked up to the ballot-box. No trembling was perceptible. They carried the ballot with ease, deposited it with coolness, watched to see that no fraud was perpetrated, and then departed as noiselessly as they came. The deed was done. Woman's honor, woman's purity, woman's domestic felicity, woman's conjugal love, woman's fidelity to her home duties, all these and a thousand other of the finer qualities were destroyed. No more peace in families; no more quiet home evenings; no more refined domestic women;

* The presidents of the Toledo Society have been, Emma J. Ashley, Elizabeth R. Collins, Sarah R. L. Williams, Rosa L. Segur, Julia P. Cole, Sarah S. Bissell, Ellen S. Fray, Mary J. Cravens. The vice-presidents, Martha Stebbins, Julia Harris, S. R. L. Williams, Sarah S. Bissell, Ellen Sully Fray, Mary J. Barker. Miss Charlotte Langdon Williams rendered valuable service in the business department of *The Ballot-Box*, and served for three years as secretary and treasurer of the association.

† Miss Anna C. Mott, and her father, Richard Mott, were two strong pillars of the woman suffrage movement in Ohio; their beautiful home has for many years been a harbor of rest alike to the advocates of anti-slavery, temperance and woman's rights.

but wrangling and discords instead. Soldiers and sailors, policemen and gravel-shovelers had taken the place of wives and mothers. Sick at heart I went to my home and wept for American womanhood. But the sun rose as usual, and the world still revolved. I went to the police-court—all was quiet. I passed to the county-court, and looked over the docket—no new divorce cases met my gaze. With unsteady hand I have opened the morning papers for the past few days, but nothing there betrayed the terrible results of that false step. Oh, women! women! In the days of Indian warfare, the skilled hunter would tell you that after an attack, when all was quiet, and you thought the enemy had departed, the greatest danger awaited, and the most careful vigilance was required. So I still keep watching, for I know the vengeance of the gods must fall upon this worse than Sodom, for since women have voted, surely there be not five righteous within the city. Real estate is not falling, however, but then!—

The evening after the election, the friends of the association and of the successful tickets, gathered to witness the incoming of the new administration. Hearty words of cheer for the future were spoken. The president, Mr. Gleason, delivered a beautiful inaugural address, of which I send you a few sentences, and the meeting adjourned.

The president said: While thanking you most heartily, ladies and gentlemen, for the distinguished honor conferred upon me in the election, I do not forget that it is due to the great principles of equal rights and universal suffrage—not to any merits of my own. We live in an age of progress. In my humble opinion we have taken a great step forward in admitting ladies to the management of this association—not only from the fact that in this particular institution they hold an equal footing with ourselves, and of right are entitled to all its privileges, but from the more important fact that it is a recognition here of those principles which are now claiming recognition in the political institutions of our country. It is in the natural order of events that this "equal rights" movement should meet with opposition. All movements of a novel and radical character at their commencement meet with opposition. This is the ordeal through which they must pass, but their success or failure depends upon their intrinsic merit. Nothing is to be feared from opposition to any movement that possesses these elements. Whatsoever idea has its origin in the recesses of human nature, will, sooner or later, become embodied in living action, and so we have this assurance—that as here, so also in the political institutions of our country—this principle of equal rights, both to man and woman, will at last prevail.

In 1871 the *Sunday Journal* offered the association half a column, which was gratefully accepted, and Mrs. Sarah Langdon Williams appointed editor. The department increased to a full page, and the circulation of the paper became as large as that of either of the city dailies. When there was danger of its being sold to opponents of the cause, Mrs. Williams purchased one-half interest, and by so doing kept the other half in the hands of the friendly proprietor. In the *Sunday Journal* the association had a medium through which it could promptly answer all unjust attacks, and thus kept up a constant agitation. In November, 1875, the sale of the paper closed for a while direct communication between the association and the public. But soon becoming restive without any medium through which to express itself, the society started *The Ballot-Box* in April, 1876, raising money among the citizens in aid of the enterprise. With this first assistance the paper became at once self-supporting, and continued thus until April, 1878,* when it was transferred to Matilda Joslyn Gage, and published at Syracuse, N. Y.

* Mrs. Williams further adds that *The Ballot-Box* became also a foster child of the National Association, Miss Anthony canvassing for it after each of her lectures during the winters of 1877 and 1878, thus largely increasing the circulation. It, on the other hand, gave full and faithful account of the work of the National Association, so that in reality it was the organ of the National as well as of the Toledo society.

The convention for the remodeling of the constitution of the State, in 1873-74, afforded an opportunity for unflagging efforts of the members of the association in the circulation of petitions; and so successful were they that when their delegates presented themselves with 1,500 signatures, asking for an amendment securing the right of suffrage to women, a member of the convention, on scanning the roll, exclaimed: "Why, you have here all the solid men of Lucas county." Mr. M. R. Waite, since chief-justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was president of the convention, and in presenting the petition said the names on that paper represented fifteen millions of dollars. Mr. Waite's courtesy indicated stronger convictions regarding the rights of women than he really possessed. In an interview with our committee, appointed to secure a hearing from the members-elect—Mr. Waite and Mr. Scribner—Mr. Waite declared himself in favor of according equal wages to women, and believed them entitled to all other rights, except the right to vote. He thought women were entitled to a hearing in the convention, and would aid them all he could to secure the privilege. Mr. Waite, with great kindness of nature, possesses an inborn conservatism which curbs his more generous impulses. He adhered to this position in his decision in the case of *Minor vs. Happersett*, declaring that "the constitution of the United States has no voters." Many of the most sanguine friends were greatly disappointed. They had fully believed his love of justice would lead him to the broad interpretation of the constitution, so clearly the true one, set forth in the first article of the fourteenth amendment. It did prevail, however, when, after saying the constitution does not confer the right of suffrage with citizenship, he said: "If the law is wrong, it ought to be changed; but the power is not with the Supreme Court."

When, in February, 1873, an irascible judge of the Court of Common Pleas refused to ratify the appointment of a woman—Miss Mary Sibley—to the office of deputy clerk, which she had filled for eight years with unusual acceptance, on the ground that not being an elector she was legally disqualified, the association determined to dispute the decision in her behalf, and on applying through their president to Mr. Waite to act as counsel, he gave his unhesitating acceptance, and declared that if the appointment was illegal, the law ought to be changed at once. True to his promise, he defended her most ably, and engaged other counsel to act with him. His services were given gratuitously.

Subsequently, in the constitutional convention, an amendment was adopted making women eligible to appointive offices, and also to any office under the school control, with the exception of State commissioner. But when voted upon, the new constitution was lost, and with it these amendments. The cause had able advocates in the convention, leading whom was General A. C. Voris of Akron, who was made chairman of the Special Committee on Woman Suffrage. The Standing Committee on Elective Franchise was extremely unfriendly, conspicuously so the chairman, Mr. Sample. A Special Committee on Woman Suffrage was appointed, which performed its duty faithfully, and reported unanimously in favor. Mr. Voris worked for the measure with an enthusiasm equaled only by his

Digitized by Google

ability. When the report came up for discussion he made a masterly speech of two hours, during which the attention was so close that a pin could be heard to drop. Other able speeches were also made in favor of the measure by some of the most talented members of the convention. It came within two votes of being carried. The defeat was largely due to the liquor influence in the convention. The cause, however, received a new impetus through the exertions of General Voris, to whom, second to no other person in Ohio, should the thanks of the women be rendered. During the contest the Toledo society was constantly on the alert. On three occasions it sent its delegates to the convention; but it has not limited its work to Ohio alone; it has given freely of its means whenever it could to aid the struggle in other States, and has rolled up large petitions to congress asking for a sixteenth amendment.

When the State convention met in Toledo, February, 1873, the members of the city society exerted themselves to the utmost to have all arrangements for their reception and entertainment of the most satisfactory character, and the delegates unanimously agreed they had never before had so delightful and successful a meeting. Many lasting friendships were formed. The opera-house was well filled at every session of the three days' convention. At the opening session a cordial address of welcome was given by Rev. Robert McCune, one of Toledo's most eloquent Republicans. The mayor of the city, Dr. W. W. Jones, a staunch Democrat, also made a courteous speech.

The Toledo Society has always held itself an independent organization, though its members, individually, have identified themselves as they chose with other associations. Its attitude has been of the most uncompromising character. It has never been cajoled into accepting a crumb in any way in the place of the whole loaf. Sometimes this has brought upon it the condemnation of friends, but in the long run it has won respect, even from bitter opponents. An illustration of this was given in its action with regard to the centennial celebration. The Fourth of July, 1876, was to be observed in Toledo as a great gala day. Long before its arrival preparations were in progress through which patriotic citizens were to express their gratitude over the nation's prosperity on the one-hundredth anniversary of freedom. All trades, professions and organizations were to join in one vast triumphal procession. A call was issued for a meeting, to which all organizations were requested to send representatives. The Woman Suffrage Association was not neglected, and a circular of invitation was mailed to its president. This raised a delicate question, for how could women take part in celebrating the triumphs of their country whose laws disfranchised them? But, having received a courteous recognition, they must respond with equal courtesy. The letter was laid before the society, and the president instructed to politely decline the honor. *The Ballot-Box* of May, 1876, contains the correspondence:

TOLEDO, Ohio, April 8, 1876.

At a meeting of citizens, held at White's Hall, on the evening of the 6th inst., the undersigned were instructed to invite your organization, with others, to send a representative to a meeting to be held at White's Hall, on the evening of Monday, April

Digitized by Google

17, which will elect an executive committee, and make other arrangements for a celebration by Toledo of the one-hundredth anniversary of American independence in a manner befitting the occasion and the character of our city. It is earnestly desired that every organization, of whatever nature, in Toledo, be represented at this meeting. We would, therefore, ask of you that you lay the matter before your organization at its next regular meeting, or in case it shall hold no meeting before the 17th, that you appear as a representative yourself. GUIDO MARX, *Chairman.*

D. R. LOCKE, JAMES H. EMORY, *Secretaries.*

This was laid before the association at a meeting which occurred the same afternoon, and by the order of the society the invitation therein conveyed was replied to in season to be read at the meeting at White's Hall, April 17:

TOLEDO, Ohio, April 15, 1876.

Hon. Guido Marx, Messrs. D. R. Locke and James H. Emory:

GENTLEMEN: The printed circular, with your names attached, inclosed to my address as president of the Toledo Woman Suffrage Association, inviting that body to send a representative to a meeting to be held at White's Hall, Monday evening, April 17, to elect an executive committee and make other arrangements for a celebration by Toledo of the one-hundredth anniversary of American independence, was received just in time to lay before the meeting held April 10. It was there decided that while the members of the association fully appreciate the generosity of the men of Toledo, and feel grateful for the implied recognition of their citizenship, yet they manifestly have no centennial to celebrate, as the government still holds them in a condition of political serfdom, denying them the greatest right of citizenship—representation.

Conscious, however, of the great results which the nation's hundred years have achieved in building up a great people, we are aware that you, as American men, have cause for rejoicing, and we bid you God-speed in all efforts which you may make in the approaching celebration. In an equal degree we feel it inconsistent, as a disfranchised class, to unite with you in the celebration of that liberty which is the heritage of but one-half the people. It is the will, therefore, of the association that I respond to the above effect, thanking you for your courteous invitation, and recognizing with pleasure among your names those who have heretofore extended to us their sympathy and aid. I remain, with sincere respect, yours,

SARAH R. L. WILLIAMS, *President T. W. S. A.*

The letter was intended to be in all respects courteous, as the writer and the society which she represented had naught but the kindest of feelings toward those who, in so friendly a manner, recognized their citizenship by inviting them to take part in the meeting, and also toward the Toledo public, who, as a general thing, had treated their organization with friendly consideration. It appears, however, that their attitude was misconstrued, according to articles subsequently published in the *Blade* and *Commercial*, which we reproduce below:

The women say they "manifestly have no centennial to celebrate." If we are not mistaken, the women of this country have enjoyed greater progress than the men under our free government, and it illy becomes them now to steadily and persistently pout because they have not yet attained the full measure of their earthly desires—the ballot-box. Better by far give a hearty show of appreciation of benefits received, and thereby materially aid in further progress. Nothing can be gained by their refusing to celebrate the one-hundredth anniversary of civil and religious liberty. The rights of all are necessarily restricted wherever there is a government, and time and experience can alone demonstrate just what extension or contraction of rights and liberties may be essential to the general good. In our judgment the women, by refusing to participate in the coming Fourth of July celebration, have committed an error, the in-

Digitized by Google

fluence of which cannot but prove prejudicial to the interests of their association. The opposite course would undoubtedly have won friends.—*Blade.*

A singularly uncourteous letter was the one sent by the Woman Suffrage Association to the meeting at White's Hall. Ninety-nine-hundredths of the women of the country will be surprised to learn that they "have no centennial to celebrate," and will be still more surprised when they discover that it is "inconsistent" for them to unite with their brothers, fathers, sons and husbands "in the celebration of the liberty which is the heritage" of *all* the people. We cannot but feel that the claims set forth by the association would command more respectful consideration with the display of a different spirit. The maids and matrons of 1776 were of a different mold.—*Commercial.*

The *Blade* has been a good friend to woman suffrage for many years, but we feel that the present article was written in a spirit of needless irritability, such as we should think might ensue from a fit of indigestion. The *Commercial*, since its change of management, has certainly not been unfriendly, and we have thought fair. Its present comments are unjust. The following editorial appeared in *The Ballot-Box* of the same date:

WHY WE CANNOT CELEBRATE THE CENTENNIAL.—The city dailies criticise the suffrage association somewhat severely for declining to unite in the centennial celebration. Perhaps from the outlook of masculine satisfaction it may seem astonishing that patriotism should not inspire us with gratitude for the crumbs from the national table; that we should not rejoice at the great banquet being prepared. But it is as impossible for us to look from their standpoint, as for them to see from ours. While appreciating the kindnesses measured out to us in this city by our friends and the press, yet laboring without visible results for the recognition of our rights as citizens of the United States, we cannot, even through the potent incentive of sympathizing with our "husbands, fathers, brothers and sons," lay aside our grievances and rejoice in a triumph which more clearly marks our own humiliation.

Can our friends inform us what is our crime, that we are denied the right of representation? Can they point to any mental or moral deficiency, to render justifiable our being denied political rights? If not—if there is no just cause for our disfranchisement, it surely should not excite surprise that we cannot rejoice with those who systematically persist in perpetrating this great wrong. With no discredit to any of the sovereign voters of this nation, we cannot forget that the most ignorant negro, the most degraded foreigner, even refugees from justice, are accorded the rights which we have been demanding in vain; and we are conscious every day and hour these privileges are denied us, that we are not only wronged by the American government, but insulted. Every year that our appeals for political rights to congress and the legislature are denied, insult is heaped upon injury. Women are told by those who are in the full enjoyment of all the privileges which this government can confer, to rejoice in what little they have, and wait patiently until more is bestowed. Wait we must, because they have the reins of power, but to wait patiently, with the light we have to perceive our relative condition, would be doing that for which we should despise ourselves.

We are not laboring for to-day alone, but for the fruition which must come from the establishment of justice. If we fail in this memorial year, a brighter day must surely come. Our failure now will be the failure of the country to improve its opportunities. All the successes which may be rejoiced over, all the triumphs of trade, commerce and invention are secondary to the rights of citizens, to those principles which lie at the foundation of national liberty. When women are recognized as citizens of this republic, there will be some occasion for their thankfulness and rejoicing; then they can join in the jubilee which celebrates the birthday of a mighty nation.

At the June meeting of the association, a declaration of rights, and a series of radical resolutions were adopted. The president urged the society to stand firm in the determination to take no part in the centen-

nial celebration, and the members of the suffrage association passed the Fourth of July quietly at their own homes, but they caused a banner, bearing the inscription, "Woman Suffrage and Equal Rights," to be hung across one of the principal streets, under which the whole procession passed. Of the original members of the society,* some who during its earlier years took an active part have removed elsewhere, and a few have passed to the beyond. But the majority still remain, and are earnest in their labors with the hope for a better day, undampened by the delays and disappoinments which attend every step in progress.

There is a flourishing association at Cleveland called the Western Reserve Club;† Mrs Sarah M. Perkins and her highly educated daughters, graduates of Vassar College, are among the leading members. They hold regular meetings, have a course of lectures every winter and are exerting a wide influence. The club consists of thirty members, paying five dollars annually into the treasury.

The Painesville Equal Rights Society,‡ formed November 20, 1883, is one of the most flourishing county associations in the State. It numbers 150 members, and it has organized many local societies in the vicinity. The annual meeting of the State society,§ held at Painesville, May 11, 12, 13, 1885, with a large representation of the most active friends present, by a unanimous vote declared itself no longer auxilary to the American, and thereby secured the coöperation of the Toledo, South Newbury, and other independent local organizations of the State.

We are indebted to Annie Laurie Quinby for the following account of the founding of a hospital for women and children, and of some of the difficulties women encountered in gaining admittance into the medical colleges:

Mrs. Quinby says: In 1867, some Cincinnati ladies met at the residence of Mrs. J. L. Roberts and organized a health association, the object of which was to obtain and disseminate knowledge in regard to the science of life and health. Mrs. Leavett addressed the ladies on the importance of instituting a medical school for women, stating a recent conversation

---

* The officers of the Toledo Society are, 1885, *President*, Mrs. Mary J. Cravens; *Vice-president*, Sarah R. L. Williams; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. E. R. Collins; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Sarah S. Bissell; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Mary J. Barker; *Executive Committee*, Mrs. Rosa L. Segur, Mrs. Julia P. Cole, Mrs. Caroline T. Morgan, Miss Anna C. Mott, Mrs. E. M. Hawley.

† *President*, Mrs. Judge Caldwell; *Secretary*, Mrs. Bushnell; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Ammon.

‡ The officers of the Painesville Society, 1885, are, *President*, Mrs. Frances Jennings Casement; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. Eliza P. Chesney, Mrs. Lydia Wilcox, Mrs. Cornelia Swezey; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. Martha Paine; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Lou J. Bates; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Adelia J. Bates; *Trustees*, Mrs. J. B. Burrows, Mrs. A. G. Smith, Mrs. C. C. Beardslee.

§ The officers of the Ohio State Association for 1885 are, *President*, Mrs. Frances M. Casement, Painesville; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. N. Coe Stewart, Cleveland; Mrs. C. C. Swezey, Painesville; Hon. Richard Mott, Toledo; Mrs. U. R. Walker, Cincinnati; Mrs. Dr. Warren, Elyria; *Recording Secretary*, Miss Mary P. Spargo, Cleveland; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Rosa L. Segur, Toledo; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Elizabeth Coit, Columbus; *Executive Committee*, Dr. N. S. Townshend, Columbus; Mrs. M. B. Haven, Cleveland; Mrs. M. Cole, Painesville; Mrs. W. J. Sheppard, Cleveland; Mrs. Elizabeth Coit, Columbus; Mrs. Ports Wilson, Warren; Mrs. Sarah M. Perkins, Cleveland.

Digitized by Google

she had with Prof. Curtis, and suggesting that he be invited to lay his views before them. A vote to that effect was passed, and in his address Professor Curtis touched the following points:

Women have greater need than men of the knowledge of the science of life, and can make more profitable use of it. *First:* They need this knowledge. In a practice of thirty-six years, full seven-tenths of my services have been devoted to women who, had they been properly instructed in the science of life, and careful to obey those instructions, would not have needed one-seventh of those services, while they would have prevented six-sevenths of their sickness, suffering and loss of time, and a like proportion of the expenses of doctoring, nursing, medicines, etc., etc. *Second:* They can make a far better and more profitable use of this knowledge than men can, because they can better appreciate the liabilities, sufferings and wants of their sex, which are far more numerous and imperative than ours; and they are always with us, from infancy to boyhood and womanhood, to watch us and protect us from injury, and to relieve us promptly from the sufferings that may afflict us, as well as to teach us how to avoid them. *Third:* Their intellectual power to learn principles is as great as ours, their perceptions are quicker than ours, their sympathies are more tender and persistent, and their watchfulness and patient perseverance with the sick are untiring. I regard the teaching and practice of the science of life as woman's peculiarly appropriate sphere. Its value to the family of the wife and the mother, is beyond estimation in dollars and cents, by the husband and father. No money that he can properly spend to secure it to his daughters, should be otherwise appropriated; for, should they never enter the family relation, it will be a means of escape from sickness mortification and expense to themselves, and of useful and honorable subsistence, not only priceless in its possession, but totally inalienable by any reverses of fortune. The possession of this knowledge from their infancy up, would do more to prevent their becoming poor and "friendless," than do all the alms houses for the former, and "homes" for the latter that society can build, while it would cost less to each individual than does an elegant modern piano. Forty years ago your speaker obtained from the legislature of Ohio a liberal university charter under the title of "The Literary and Botanical Medical College of Ohio," which was afterwards changed to "The Cincinnati Literary and Scientific Institute and Physio-Medical College." By the aid of able assistants he conducted this institution for the benefit of men only, till, in 1851, the students of the class were between eighty and ninety. From that time to the present, he has received women into the classes and demonstrated that they are not only as competent as men to learn all parts of the science of life, but, in very many particulars, far better qualified for the practice of the art of curing disease. The last session of the college was suspended that he might travel in the country and learn the disposition of the friends of progress to establish the institution on a permanent foundation, and is happy to say that all that seems necessary to that glorious consummation is the prompt and concentrated effort of a few judicious and influential ladies and their friends to secure pecuniary aid.

June 11, 1879, a dispensary for women and children was opened in Cincinnati, by Drs. Ellen M. Kirk, and M. May Howells, graduates of the New York College and Hospital for Women. Their undertaking proving successful, with other ladies of wealth and ability they soon after established a hospital. November 1, 1881, the certificate of incorporation was filed in the office of the secretary of state. The ladies labored unweariedly for the support of these institutions. At two public entertainments they realized nearly a thousand dollars. For the establishment of a hom-

* The incorporators were, Mrs. Davies Wilson, Mrs. John Goddard, Mrs. Jane Wendte, Mrs. William N. Hobart, Dr. Ellen M. Kirk, Dr. M. May Howells, Miss Jennie S. Smith, and Miss Harriet M. Hinsdale; *Resident Physician*, Dr. Sarah J. Bebout; *Visiting Physicians*, Drs. Ellen M. Kirk, M. May Howells.

Digitized by Google

eopathic college they manifested equal earnestness and enthusiasm. Many of them interested in this mode of practice, seeing the trials of Dr. Pulte in introducing this new theory of medicine, determined to help him in building up a college and hospital for that practice. By one fair they raised $13,500, net profits, and the Pulte Medical College was established. But the remarkable fact about these institutions is that after being started through the labors of women, women appealed in vain for admission for scholarships for a long time. For a clear understanding of the matter, and a knowledge of the defense made in behalf of the right of women to enter the college, I send you the following from Dr. J. D. Buck:

Pulte Medical College, of Cincinnati, was organized under the common law, and opened in 1872, for the admission of students, with no provision, either for or against the admission or women. From time to time, during the first seven years, the subject of the admission of women was broached, but generally bullied out of court amid sneers and ridicule. The faculty stood five against and four for. The opposition was the most pronounced and bitter imaginable, the staple argument being that the mingling of the sexes in medical colleges led always and necessarily to licentiousness.

Finally, in the fall of 1877, seven of the nine members of the faculty voted to admit women. One professor voted no, and the leader of the opposition, Prof. S. R. Beckwith—a life-long opponent of the broader culture of women—left the meeting with the purpose of arresting all action. In this, however, he failed; the vote was confirmed.

On the following day another meeting was held, when the vote was re-considered and again confirmed, each of the seven members agreeing to stand by it. Still again, another meeting was called, at the instance of the leader of the opposition, and in the absence of two of the staunch friends, a bare majority of the whole faculty voted to exclude women, as heretofore, and notified the applicants for admission, who had been officially informed of the previous resolution to admit them, that they would not be admitted.

Forbearance on the part of the friends of justice was no more to be thought of, and notice was given that the wrong should be righted, at all hazards. For the next two years war raged persistent and unflinching on the part of the friends of the rights of women, bitter and slanderous on the part of the opposition. All the tricks of the politician were resorted to to defeat the cause of right, and more than once by misrepresentation they obtained the announcement in the public press that the case was decided, and women forever excluded. Still the cause moved on to complete triumph, and to the disgrace and final exclusion from the college of two of the most bitter leaders of the opposition.

In the fall of 1879 it was announced in the annual catalogue, "that students will be admitted to the lectures of Pulte college without distinction of sex," a very simple result indeed, as the outcome of two years' warfare. At the opening of lectures the first of October, four female students presented themselves, and were admitted to matriculation. Every prophecy of disaster had failed. The class was an increase in numbers over that of any preceding year, and showed a marked improvement in deportment and moral tone from the presence of ladies, who from their high character and bearing exerted a restraining influence, as they always do, on those disposed to be gentlemen. At the commencement exercises in March, 1881, three women, viz: Miss S. C. O'Keefe, Mrs. Mary N. Street, and Mrs. M. J. Taylor, received the degree of the college, after having attended the same lectures and been submitted to the same examination as the male graduates. The prize for the best examination (in writing) in physiology, was awarded to Miss Stella Hunt, of Cincinnati. The right of women to admittance to this college cannot again be raised except by a two-thirds vote of both faculty and trustees —a majority which will be difficult to obtain after the record which the women have already made as students in the institution. Yours truly, J. D. BUCK.

Digitized by Google

After all this educational work and this seeming triumph for the recognition of an equal status in the colleges for women, we find this item going the rounds of the daily journals, under date of Cleveland, March 29, 1885:

Considerable excitement prevails among the homeopathists of Cleveland. Commencement exercises of the college are to be held next Tuesday evening, and Miss Madge Dickson, of Chambers, Pa., was to have delivered the salutatory address. Dr. H. H. Baxter, a prominent professor of the college, objected, saying a woman salutatorian would disgrace the college. Miss Dickson resigned the honor, and no address will be delivered.

In April, 1873, Miss Nettie Cronise of Tiffin, was admitted to the bar. In the following September, her sister Florence was admitted, and they practiced as N. & F. Cronise, until Miss Nettie's marriage with N. B. Lutes, with whom she has since been associated under the firm name of Lutes & Lutes. Miss Florence Cronise has her office in Tiffin. Soon after commencing practice Mrs. Lutes was appointed to examine applicants for admission to the bar, the first instance of a woman serving in this capacity in the United States, although Florence Cronise and one or two other women have since done like duty. These ladies and Miss Hulett were the first women to open law offices and begin an active, energetic practice of the profession.

In 1885, Miss Mary P. Spargo of Cleveland, was admitted to the bar.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XLI.

MICHIGAN.

Women's Literary Clubs and Libraries—Mrs. Lucinda H. Stone—Classes of Girls in Europe—Ernestine L. Rose—Legislative Action, 1849–1885—State Woman Suffrage Society, 1870—Annual Conventions—Northwestern Association—Wendell Phillips' Letter—Nannette Gardner Votes—Catharine A. F. Stebbins Refused—Legislative Action—Amendments Submitted—An Active Canvass of the State by Women—Election Day—The Amendment Lost, 40,000 Men Voted in Favor—University at Ann Arbor Opened to Girls, 1869—Kalamazoo Institute—J. A. B. Stone, Miss Madeline Stockwell and Miss Sarah Burger Applied for Admission to the University in 1857—Episcopal Church Bill—Local Societies—Quincy—Lansing—St. Johns—Manistee—Grand Rapids—Sojourner Truth—Laura C. Haviland—Sybil Lawrence.

TRAVELING through the State of Michigan, sufficiently at leisure to make acquaintances, one would readily remark the unusual intelligence and cultivation of the women. Every large town can boast a woman's literary club, a reading-room, nicely furnished, with a library containing, in many cases, one and two thousand volumes, a choice collection of scientific, historical and classical works. This may be attributed in part to the fact that the population is largely from New York and New England, partly to the many institutions of learning early opened to girls, and partly to the extensive social influence of Mrs. Lucinda H. Stone,* whose rare culture, foreign travels and liberal views have fitted her, both as a woman and as a teacher, to inspire the girls of Michigan with a desire for thorough education. Mrs. Stone has traveled through many countries in the old world with large classes of young ladies under her charge, superintending their reading and studies, and giving them lectures on history and art on classic ground, where some of the greatest tragedies of the

* Having made many lyceum trips through Michigan, I have had several opportunities of meeting Mrs. Stone in her own quiet home, and I can readily understand the wide influence she exerted on the women of that State, and what a benediction her presence must have been in all the reform associations in which she took an active part. I always felt that Michigan would be a grand State in which to make the experiment of woman suffrage, especially as in Mrs. Stone we had an enthusiastic coadjutor. In paying this well-deserved tribute to Mrs. Stone, I must not forget to mention that Mrs. Janney of Flint, a woman of great executive ability, started the first woman's reading-room and library many years ago.—[E. C. S.

past were enacted; in ancient palaces, temples and grand cathedrals; upon the very spots still rich with the memories of kings and popes, great generals, statesmen, poets and philosophers. We cannot estimate the advantages to these young travelers of having one always at hand, able to point out the beauties in painting and statuary, to interpret the symbols and mysteries of architecture, the language of music, the facts of history, and the philosophy of the rise and fall of mighty nations. Mrs. Stone has also given courses of parlor lectures to large classes of ladies in every city of the State, thus, with her rare experiences and extensive observations, enriching every circle of society in which she moved.

To Catharine A. F. Stebbins we are indebted for compiling many of the facts contained in this chapter. Reviewing the last forty years, she says:

The agitation on the question of woman suffrage began in this State in 1846, with the advent of Ernestine L. Rose,* who spoke twice in the legislative hall in Detroit—once on the "Science of Government," and once on the "Antagonisms in Society." A resolution was passed by the House of Representatives, expressing a high sense of her ability, eloquence and grace of delivery. Her work in Detroit, Ann Arbor and other places was three or four years prior to the first report by the Special Committee of the Senate in the general revision of the constitution, nine years before the House Committee's report on elections in response to women's petitions, and a dozen years before the favorable "report of the Senate upon the memorial of ladies praying for the privilege of the elective franchise," signed by Thomas W. Ferry.

The Revolution of April 30, 1868, gives an account of the manner the women of Sturgis voted on the question of prohibition:

"A few weeks ago, at a large meeting of the citizens of Sturgis, Michigan, the ladies were asked to help in the coming election the cause of prohibition. They replied that they would if they were allowed to vote. At a subsequent meeting the gentlemen could do no less than to invite them. A committee of twelve was appointed. They canvassed the village and invited all the ladies to come out and join in the demonstration. At 2 o'clock on election day they assembled at Union School Hall and marched to the room where the election was held, and one hundred and fourteen deposited their votes in favor of prohibition, and six against it. Whilst they were marching through the room the utmost order prevailed, and when they were retiring three hearty cheers were given for the ladies of Sturgis. Great credit is due to Mrs. William Kyte, chairman of the committee, as well as to all the other members, for their management of the whole affair. The utmost good feeling prevailed, and not a sneer or a jeer was heard from the lords of creation, but a large majority seemed to hail this as a precursor of what they expect in the future, when the people shall be educated to respect the rights of all."

We find the above in the Sturgis *Journal*, by the way, one of the best in tone and

* A sketch of this brilliant Polish woman, who has taken such an active part in the woman suffrage movement, both in this country and England, will be found in Volume I., page 95.

talent of all our western exchanges. Its editor, Mr. Wait, is a prominent leader in the State, a member of the legislature, and a believer in the equal civil and political rights of women. We have more than once suggested in *The Revolution* that the women should appear at the polls on election days and demand their rights as citizens. The effect could not but be beneficial wherever tried. Any considerable number of intelligent women in almost any locality would in this way soon inaugurate a movement to result in a speedy triumph. Let these noble Sturgis women persevere. Methodist Bishop Simpson was right when he declared the vote of woman at the polls would soon extinguish the perdition fires of intemperance. The Sturgis women have begun the good work, a hundred and fourteen to six! Surely, blessed are the husbands and children of such wives and mothers. P. P.

In *The Revolution* of September 3, 1868, we find the following from the Sturgis *Star:*

Last spring the ladies of Sturgis went to the polls one hundred and twenty in number, and demonstrated the propriety of the movement. Their votes did not count, for they could only be cast in a separate box, and the movement was only good in its moral effect. But at the school meeting the ladies have an equal right to vote with the men. Whatever qualifications a man must possess to exercise privileges in that meeting, any woman possessing like qualifications can exercise like privileges there. To substantiate this, it is only necessary to read the school law. Section 145 of the Primary School law: "The words 'qualified voter' shall be taken and construed to mean and include *all taxable persons* residing in the district of the age of twenty-one years, and who have resided therein three months next preceding the time of voting."

Ex-State Superintendent John M. Gregory's opinion of that is, that "under this section (145) all persons liable to be taxed in the district, and twenty-one years of age, and having resided three months in the district, without distinction of sex, color, or nationality, may vote in the district meetings." In districts where they elect only a director, assessor and moderator, the women can vote on all questions except the election of officers. In graded districts they can vote on all questions, election of trustees included. Men having no taxable property, but who vote at town meetings and general elections, can only vote for trustees at a school meeting. Any woman, then, having a watch, cow, buggy, or personal property of any kind, subject to tax, or who has real estate in her own name, or jointly with her husband, can vote. Here, then, is a lawful right for women to vote at school meetings, and as there can be no impropriety in it, we advocate it. We believe that it will work good. Our Union school is something that all should feel an active interest in. We hope, then, that those ladies entitled to vote will exercise the rights that the law grants them. To give these suggestions a practical effect, we cheerfully publish the following notice:

The undersigned respectfully request those ladies residing in District No. 3, of the township of Sturgis, who are entitled to vote at the annual meeting, to assemble in Mrs. Pendleton's parlor, at the Exchange Hotel, on Friday evening next, August 28, at 7.30 o'clock, to consider the matter of exercising the privilege which the law gives them.

This call is signed by about twenty of the best women of the borough. Last week we called attention in *The Revolution* to the earnestness of the English women in urging their claim to the right of suffrage, and appealed to American women from their example. We hear from different sources that American women will attempt, to some extent, to be registered this year as voters, and we hope so brave an example will become a contagion. A boastful warrior once demanded of his foe, "Deliver up your arms." The answer was, "Come, if you dare, and take them!" Let women become brave enough to take their rights, and there will not be much resistance. According to their faith and their courage, so shall it be. P. P.

The Michigan State Suffrage Society—always an independent association—was organized at the close of the first convention held in Ham-

Digitized by Google

blin's Opera-house, Battle Creek,* January 20, 1870, and has done the usual work of aiding in the formation of local societies, circulating tracts and petitions, securing hearings before the legislature, and holding its annual meetings from year to year in the different cities of the State.

The Northwestern Association held its first annual convention in the Young Men's Hall, Detroit, November 28, 29, 1870, with large and appreciative audiences.† Legislative action on the question of woman suffrage began in Michigan in 1849, when:

The special report favorable to Senate document No. 10, for universal suffrage, was signed by Dwight Webb, Edward H. Thompson and Rix Robinson.—House document No. 31, legislature of 1855: "The Committee on Elections, to whom was referred the petition of Betsy P. Parker, Lucinda Knapp, Nancy Fleming, Electa Myers, and several other 'strong-minded' ladies of Lenawee county, asking such amendments to the constitution of the State as will secure to women an equal right to the elective franchise with men," reported adversely, ridiculed the petitioners, and was signed by A. P. Moorman.—Senate document No. 27, in the session of 1857: On a memorial of ladies praying the legislature to grant them the elective franchise, the report was signed by Thomas W. Ferry, and was favorable and respectful.—House document No. 25, legislature of 1859: On constitutional amendments in favor of universal suffrage, the report was favorable for extending suffrage to colored men, but doubtful as to the wisdom of extending it to women. This was signed by Fabius Miles, chairman.—Senate document No. 12: Upon the same constitutional amendments, in the legislature of 1859, the report signed by R. E. Trowbridge, chairman of the committee, was adverse to extending suffrage to women.

On February 13, 1873, Mr. Lamb introduced "a joint resolution granting the privilege of the elective franchise to the women of the State." Mr. Bartholomew introduced "a joint resolution proposing an amendment to section 1, article I., of the constitution, in relation to the qualifications of electors." Both were referred to the Committee on Elections, which made the following report:

The Committee on Elections, to whom was referred the joint resolution granting the privilege of the elective franchise to women of this State, respectfully report that they have had the same under consideration, and have directed me to report the same back to the House without recommendation. We think the time has not arrived for us to decide on so important a matter. We await further developments, and are under the impression that there is no popular demand for the change—at least not suffi-

* The speakers at the Battle Creek convention were Miriam M. Cole, editor of *The Woman's Advocate*, Dayton, Ohio; Mary A. Livermore, editor *Woman's Journal*, Boston; Hannah Tracy Cutler, Illinois; Rev. J. M. McCarthy, Saginaw; Mrs. J. C. Dexter, Ionia; Mrs. D. C. Blakeman, Lucinda H. Stone, Kalamazoo; Adelle Hazlett, Hillsdale; Rev. J. S. Loveland, D. M. Fox, Battle Creek; Mary T. Lathrop, Jackson. Letters of sympathy were received from B. F. Cocker and Moses Coit Tyler, professors of the Michigan State University. The officers of the State association were: *President*, Professor Moses Coit Tyler, Ann Arbor; *Vice-President*, Lucinda H. Stone; *Recording Secretary*, Mary T. Lathrop; *Corresponding Secretary*, Euphemia Cochran, Detroit; *Treasurer*, Colin Campbell, Detroit; *Executive Committee*, Dr. S. B. Thayer, Frances W. Titus, Battle Creek; Eliza Burt Gamble, East Saginaw; Catharine A. F. Stebbins, Detroit; Hon. J. G. Wait, Sturgis; Mrs. D. C. Blakeman, Kalamazoo; Mrs. L. H. T. Dexter, Ionia.

† The speakers at the Northwestern convention were Mrs. Hazlett, the president; Hon. C. B. Waite, Professor D. C. Brooks, Chicago; Susan B. Anthony, Celia Burleigh, New York; Lillie Peckham, Wisconsin; Mrs. Lathrop, Jackson; Giles B. Stebbins, Adam Elder, J. B. Bloss, Detroit. Letters were reported from Henry Ward Beecher, Wendell Phillips, Rev. E. O. Haven, Professor B. F. Cocker, Moses Coit Tyler, Mrs. Livermore, Lucy Stone, H. B. Blackwell, Mrs. Josephine Griffing, T. W. Higginson, Theodore Tilton, Phœbe Couzins, Anna E. Dickinson, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Miriam M. Cole and Rev. Robert Collyer. The officers elected were: *President*, Mrs. A. M. Hazlett, Michigan; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. Rebecca W. Mott, Chicago; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Harriet S. Brooks, Chicago; *Treasurer*, Hon. Fernandol Jones, Chicago; *Vice-Presidents*, J. B. Bloss, Michigan; Mrs. Myra Bradwell, Illinois; Mrs. E. R. Collins, Ohio; Mrs. Dr. Ferguson, Indiana; Miss Phœbe Couzins, Missouri; *Executive Committee*, C. B. Waite, Chicago; Colin Campbell, Detroit; Mrs. Francis Minor, Missouri; Madame Anneke, Wisconsin; Mrs. Charles Leonard and Mrs. E. J. Loomis, Chicago.

cient to warrant us in recommending so important a change in our form of government at the present session of the legislature—and ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject. [Signed:] A. HEWITT, *Acting Chairman.*

Motion carried to lay the joint resolution on the table. March 4, it was taken from the table and referred to the Committee of the Whole, who recommended its passage, and April 10 it was lost by a vote of 50 to 24:

The committee have considered the matters embraced in the several resolutions referred to them relative to providing for woman's suffrage, and have instructed me to report against adding any such provision to the constitution at present. The committee ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

[Signed:] E. W. MEDDAUGH, *Chairman.*

October 14.—A bill for separate submission to a vote of the people of an amendment to the constitution relating to woman's suffrage, was lost by a tie vote—7 for and 7 against.

At the extra session of the legislature, 1874, in the House, March 10, Mr. Hoyt introduced a joint resolution for separate submission to a vote of the people of an amendment to the constitution relating to woman suffrage. Referred to the Committee on Elections and State Affairs, jointly. On March 12 the following memorial from the State Woman Suffrage Association * was presented in the House:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, in Special Session Convened:

The Executive Committee of the Michigan State Woman Suffrage Association, at their meeting held in Kalamazoo, February 10, 1874, voted to memorialize your honorable body, at your special session now being held.

We beg leave to represent to you that the object of this association is to secure, in a legal way, the enfranchisement of the women of the State. They are, as you well know, already recognized as citizens of the State according to the laws of the United States. They are now taxed for all purposes of public interest as well as the men. But they are not represented in the legislature, nor in any branch of the State government, thus affording a great example, and an unjust one for women, of taxation without representation, which our fathers declared to be tyranny; and which is contrary to the genius of our republican institutions, and to the general polity of this commonwealth. Women are also governed, while they have no direct voice in the government, and made subject to laws affecting their property, their personal rights and liberty, in whose enactment they have no voice.

We therefore petition your honorable body, that in preparing a new constitution, to be submitted for adoption or rejection by the people of this State, you will strike out the word "male" from the article defining the qualifications of electors; or if deemed best by you, will provide for the separate submission of an article for the enfranchisement of the women of Michigan, giving them equal rights and privileges with the men. By thus taking the lead of the States of the Union, to more fully secure the personal rights of all the citizens, you will show yourselves in harmony with the spirit of the age and worthy to be called pioneers in this cause, as you are already most honorably accounted pioneers in your educational system, which affords equal and impartial advantages to the population of our State, irrespective of sex or condition in life—thus aiming to elevate the entire people to the highest practicable plane of intelligence and true civilization.

By order, and in the name of the Michigan Woman Suffrage Association.

LUCINDA H. STONE, *Corresponding Secretary.*

Mrs. A. H. WALKER, *President.*

On March 14, the joint committee made the following report:

The committees on State affairs and elections, to whom was referred the joint resolution proposing an amendment to section 1, article VII., of the constitution, in relation to the qualifications of electors, respectfully report that they have had the same under consideration, and have directed us to report the same back to the House without amendment, and recommend that it do pass and ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject.

---

* *President*, Mrs. A. H. Walker; *Corresponding Secretary*, Lucinda H. Stone; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. S. E. Emory; *Treasurer*, Mrs. E. Metcalf; *Executive Committee*, Dr. J. A. B. Stone, Mrs. Frances Titus, Mrs. O. A. Jennison, Mrs. C. A. F. Stebbins, Mrs. D. C. Blakeman, Mrs. L. B. Curtiss, Dr. J. H. Bartholomew.

Digitized by Google

The reasons which have influenced the committee in recommending an amendment so radical and sweeping in the changes which it will create if finally adopted by the people, are briefly these: The question of granting the right of suffrage to women equally with men, is one that has been seriously and widely agitated for years, and while, like other political reforms which change in any considerable degree the old and established order of things, it has met with strong opposition, on the other hand it has been ably advocated by men and women distinguished alike for their intellectual ability and their excellent judgment. Although we believe that there should be certain necessary and proper restrictions to the exercise of the elective franchise, we are of the opinion that there are reasonable grounds to doubt whether the distinction of sex in the matter of voting, is not, in a large measure, a fictitious one. The interests of women in all matters pertaining to good government are certainly identical with those of men. In the matter of property their rights conceded by law are equal, and in some respects superior to those of men; and if the principle of no taxation without representation is a just one as applied among men, it would seem that it might in justice be extended to women. As the reasons given above are strongly urged by the advocates of woman suffrage, and as several petitions, numerously signed by citizens of the State, asking for some action on the part of the House in this matter, are in the hands of the committee, we have deemed it advisable, although not equally agreed as to the main question involved, to recommend the passage of the resolution by the House, in order that the people of the State may have an opportunity of expressing their will at the ballot-box as to the expediency of extending the right of suffrage to women. SAMUEL H. BLACKMAN, *Chairman of Committee on State Affairs.*
JAMES BURNES, *Chairman of Committee on Elections.*

Report accepted, and joint resolution placed on the general order.

On March 18 the following joint resolution passed the House by a vote of 67 to 27, and passed the Senate by a vote of 26 to 4,* proposing an amendment to section 1 of article VII. of the constitution, in relation to the qualification of electors:

Resolved, By the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, That at the election when the amended constitution shall be submitted to the electors of this State for adoption or rejection, there shall be submitted to such electors the following propositions, to be substituted in case of adoption, for so much of section 1, of article VII., as precedes the proviso therein, in the present constitution of this State as it now stands, and substituted for section 1, article VII., in said amended constitution, if the latter is adopted, to wit:

SECTION 1. In all elections, every person of the age of twenty-one years who shall have resided in this State three months, and in the township or ward in which he or she offers to vote ten days next preceding an election, belonging to either of the following classes, shall be an elector and entitled to vote:

First—Every citizen of the United States; *Second*—Every inhabitant of this State, who shall have resided in the United States two years and six months, and declared his or her intention to become a citizen of the United States pursuant to the laws thereof, six months preceding an election; *Third*—Every inhabitant residing in this State on the twenty-fourth day of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-five.

Said proposition shall be separately submitted to the electors of this State for their adoption or rejection, in form following, to wit: A separate ballot may be given by every person having the right to vote, to be deposited in a separate box. Upon the ballot given for said proposition shall be written, or printed, or partly written and partly printed, the words, "Woman Suffrage,—Yes"; and upon ballots given against the adoption thereof, in like manner, the words, "Woman Suffrage,—No." If at said election a majority of the votes given upon said proposition shall contain the words, "Woman Suffrage,—Yes," then said proposition shall be substituted for so much of section 1, of article VII., as includes the proviso therein in the present constitution of

* The following named representatives voted *yea:* Messrs. Armstrong, Bailey, Bartholomew, Blackman, Briggs, Brown, Brunson, Buell, Burns, Cady, Carter, Chamberlain, Collins, Dintruff, Drake, Drew, Edwards, Fancher, Ferguson, Garfield, Gravelink, Gilmore, Goodrich, Gordon, Green, Haire, Harden, Hewitt, Hosner, Howard, Hoyt, Kellogg, Knapp, Lamb, Luce, E. R. Miller, R. C. Miller, Mitchell, Morse, O'Dell, Parker, Parsons, Pierce, Priest, Remer, Rich, Robinson, Sanderson, Scott, Sessions, Shaw, Smith, Taylor, Thomas, Thompson, VanAken, VanScoy, A. Walker, F. Walker, Walton, Warren, Welch, Welker, Wheeler, Withington, Wixon, Speaker—67. The following named Senators voted *yea:* Messrs. Anderson, Beattie, Brewer, Butterfield, Childs, Clubb, Cook, Crosby, Curry, DeLand, Ely, Goodell, Gray, Hewitt, Isham, Lewis, Mickley, Mitchell, McGowan, Neasmith, Pritzman, Richardson, Sparks, Sumner, Sutton, Wells—26.

Digitized by Google

the State as it now stands, or substituted for section I, of article VII., in said amended constitution, if the latter is adopted.

This bill was promptly signed by Governor Bagley, and from that hour the attention of the advocates of suffrage for women was centered on Michigan.

The submission of this amendment to a vote of the people, gave an unusual interest and importance to the annual meeting held at Lansing, May 6, 1874,* at which plans were to be made, and money raised for a vigorous campaign throughout the State. The large number of women ready to do the speaking, and the equally large number of men ready to make generous contributions, were most encouraging in starting. Women who could not aid the cause in any other way cast their gold watches into the treasury. From the large number of letters received at this convention we may judge how thoroughly aroused the friends were all over the country. Lydia Maria Child wrote:

It is urged, that if women participated in public affairs, puddings would be spoiled, and stockings neglected. Doubtless some such cases might occur; for we have the same human nature as men, and men are sometimes so taken up with elections as to neglect their business for a while. But I apprehend that puddings and stockings, to say nothing of nurseries, suffer much greater detriment from the present expenditure of time and thought upon the heartless ostentation of parties, and the flounces and fripperies of fashion, than can possibly accrue from the intellectual cultivation of women, or their participation in public affairs. Voting is a mere incident in the lives of men. It does not prevent the blacksmith from shoeing horses, or the farmer from planting fields, or the lawyer from attending courts; so I see no reason why it need to prevent women from attending to their domestic duties. On certain subjects, such as intemperance, licentiousness and war, women would be almost universally sure to exert their influence in the right directions, for the simple reason that they peculiarly suffer from the continuance of these evils. In the discharge of this new function, they would doubtless make some mistakes, and yield to some temptations, just as men do. But the consciousness of being an acknowledged portion of the government of the country would excite a deeper interest in its welfare, and produce a serious sense of responsibility, which would gradually invigorate and ennoble their characters.

THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON wrote: I believe that we fail to establish a truly republican government, or to test the principle of universal suffrage, so long as we enfranchise one sex only.

A. BRONSON ALCOTT wrote: * * * Where women lead—the best women—is it unsafe for men to follow? Woman's influence cannot be confined to her household;

---

* Officers of the Michigan State Woman Suffrage Association: *President*, Hon. Jonas H. McGowan, Coldwater; *Vice-Presidents*, Rev. Richmond Fiske Jr., Grand Haven, Mrs. John J. Bagley, Detroit; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. N. Geddes, Lenawee; *Secretary and Treasurer*, George H. Stickney, Grand Haven; *Executive Committee*, Chairman, Hon. William M. Ferry, Grand Haven; First District—Giles B. Stebbins, Z. R. Brockway, Wayne; Second District—Hon. Charles E. Mickley, Lenawee, Mrs. M. A. Hazlett, Hillsdale; Third District—Hon. W. H. Withington, Jackson, Morgan Bates, Calhoun; Fourth District—James H. Stone, Kalamazoo, Miss Sarah Clute, St. Joseph; Fifth District—Hon. B. A. Harlan, Mrs. M. C. Bliss, Kent; Sixth District—Hon. I. H. Bartholomew, Ingham, Mrs. A. Jenney, Genesee; Seventh District—Hon. J. C. Lamb, Lapeer, J. P. Hoyt, Tuscola; Eighth District—Hon. C. V. DeLand, Saginaw, Hon. J. D. Lewis, Bay; Ninth District—Hon. E. L. Gray, Newaygo, Mrs. J. G. Ramsdell, Grand Traverse; *Vice-Presidents by Congressional Districts*, First District—Mrs. Eliza Leggett, Hon. W. N. Hudson, Wayne; Second District—Hon. W. S. Wilcox, Lenawee, Hon. Talcott E. Wing, Monroe; Third District—Mrs. Ann E. Graves, Calhoun, Mrs. Mary Lathrop, Jackson; Fourth District—Hon. Levi Sparks, Berrien, Rev. H. C. Peck, Kalamazoo; Fifth District—Hon. S. L. Withey, Hon. James Miller, Kent; Sixth District—Hon. Randolph Strickland, Clinton, C. F. Kimball, Oakland; Seventh District—Hon. Ira Butterfield, Lapeer, John M. Potter, Macomb; Eighth District—Hon. Ralph Ely, Gratiot, Mrs. S. M. Green, Bay; Ninth District—Elvin L. Sprague, Grand Traverse, S. W. Fowler, Manistee.

Digitized by Google

woman is, and will be, womanly wherever placed. No condition can unsex the sexes. The ten commandments will not suffer in her keeping. Her vote will tell for the virtues, against the vices all. Plato said: "Either sex alone is but half itself." Socially, we admit his assertion, and are just beginning to suspect that our republican institutions need to be complemented and rounded with woman's counsels, and administrations also. Good republicans are asking if our legislation is not unsettled, demoralized by the debauchery of hasty politics, by private vices, and the want of manly integrity, woman's honor. Let our courtesy to women be sincere—paid to her modesty as to her person; her intelligence as to her housekeeping; her refining influence in political as in social circles. Where a husband would blush to take his wife and daughters, let him blush to be seen by his sons. "Revere no god," says Euripides, "whom men adore by night." And Sophocles: "Seek not thy fellow-citizens to guide till thou canst order well thine own fireside." Mrs. Alcott and Louisa join in hearty hopes for your success.

EDNA D. CHENEY wrote: * * * How I long for the time when this question being settled, we can all go forward, working together, to discuss and settle the really great questions of political and social economy, of labor, of education, and the full development of human life in State and society.

JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER wrote: * * * I hope and trust the electors will be wise and generous enough to decide it in your favor. Were I a citizen of the State I should esteem it alike a duty and a privilege to vote in the affirmative.

ASA MAHAN, president of Oberlin College, wrote: The cause which has called you together is a very plain one. It is simply this, whether "taxation without representation" is tyranny to all but one-half of the human race, and the principle that rulers derive their authority to make and administer law from the consent of the governed, holds true of the white man and the black man, of man native or foreign born, and even of the "heathen Chinee," if he belong to the male sex, and is a lie in its application to woman.*

Dr. Stone, of Kalamazoo, read an able report of what had been done, and all it was necessary to do if the friends desired to carry the pending amendment. The following extract will give some idea of the momentous undertaking in canvassing a State:

When the governor decided to call an extra session of the legislature, so as to submit the new constitution to a popular vote next November, the committee had but little time for the circulation of petitions; but enough was done to secure the vote in favor of submission. This was the more easily accomplished because we have in the present legislature so many warm and active friends, who gave that body no rest until their point was carried. And here we find ourselves suddenly brought into a campaign almost as novel as momentous, with scarce a precedent to guide us. We ask the electors of Michigan to share their civil and political power with those who have always been denied all electoral rights—to vest the popular sovereignty not merely in themselves, in a quarter of a million of men, as hitherto, but in half a million of men and women, and so make our State what it is not now, a truly republican commonwealth. We have a great work before us, and no time should be lost in organizing a general canvass of the entire State. Competent lecturers should be employed wherever hearers can be found, and money raised to defray the expenses. Printed documents too, must be circulated; arguments and conclusions framed by those who have thought on these subjects for men, and sometimes for women, who are too indolent to think for themselves. And there are many other things which we must do before the November election; ballots must be furnished for every township and polling place, especially affirmative ballots, and placed in the hands of all the voters. The Executive Committee cannot

* Among many others were letters from Amos Dresser, Parker Pillsbury, Henry B. Blackwell, Rev. S. Reed, of Ann Arbor, William Lloyd Garrison, Lucy Stone, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Dr. Henry B. Baker, Miriam M. Cole, Margaret V. Longley, Abby and Julia Smith, of Glastonbury, Conn., A. C. Voris, from the Ohio constitutional convention, Hon. J. Logan Chipman.

be ubiquitous enough to discharge all these multifarious duties. We therefore suggest that there be appointed during this meeting, *First*, a Committee on Finance. *Second*, a Committee on Printed Documents. *Third*, a Committee on Lecturers. *Fourth*, a County Committee of perhaps three persons in each county, who shall have power also to appoint a sub-committee in each township. Whether so many distinct committees will be needed, or more than one class of duties can be entrusted to the same committee, the association can determine. We do not want too much, nor too complicated machinery, but just enough to accomplish the work. We must fall into line; woman expects every man to do his duty; surely she will not fail to be true to herself.

Representatives from the different counties gave their names * as ready to begin the work arranged by the several committees. With this large and enthusiastic convention the campaign may be said fairly to have opened at Lansing early in May, a political organization being formed of Republicans and Democrats alike, representing nearly every district in the State. Governor Bagley having promptly signed the bill, and his wife being an earnest advocate of the measure, the social influence of the family was all in the right direction. The influence of the church, too, was in a measure favorable. The Methodist denomination, in its general conference, passed a resolution indorsing woman suffrage. Mrs. Stanton, in a letter to the *Golden Age*, said:

During the time I spent in Michigan, speaking every night and twice on Sunday to crowded houses, I had abundant opportunities of feeling the pulse of the people, both in public and private, and it seemed to me that the tide of popular thought and feeling was running in the right direction. The people are beginning to regard the idea of woman's equality with man as not only a political, but a religious truth, Methodist, Congregational, Presbyterian, Baptist and Unitarian churches being all alike thrown open to its consideration. Sitting Sunday after Sunday in the different pulpits with reverend gentlemen, my discourses given in the place of the sermon, in the regular services, I could not help thinking of the distance we had come since that period in civilization when Paul's word was law, "Let your women keep silence in the churches." Able men and women are speaking in every part of the State, and if our triumph should not be complete at the next election, at all events a great educational work will have been accomplished in the distribution of tracts, in the public de-

* The following persons were announced and requested to communicate at once with the Executive Committee, George H. Stickney, Secretary, Grand Haven, Mich.: *Allegan*, Mrs. E. S. Nichols; *Barry*, Mrs. Goodyear; *Bay*, Mrs. S. M. Green, Mrs. Judge Holmes; *Berrien*, Hon. Levi Sparks, O. E. Mead; *Branch*, Mrs. Celia Woolley, Mrs. H. J. Boutelle; *Calhoun*, W. F. Neil, Mrs. Judge Graves, Morgan Bates, Dr. G. P. Jocelyn; *Cass*, Mr. Rice, William L. Jaques; *Chippewa*, Mrs. Charles G. Shepherd; *Clinton*, Mrs. Lee, Mrs. Gole; *Eaton*, J. Chance, Hon. A. K. Warren, Mrs. J. Musgrave, Mr. and Mrs. E. A. Foote; *Genesee*, Mrs. D. Stewart; *Grand Traverse*, Hon. W. H. C. Mitchell, Hon. J. G. Ramsdell; *Gratiot*, Hon. Ralph Ely; *Hillsdale*, Mrs. M. A. Pendill, Mrs. Dr. Swift, Mrs. E. Samm; *Ingham*, Dr. I. H. Bartholomew, Mrs. O. A. Jenison, A. R. Burr; *Ionia*, Mrs. A. Williams, Mrs. Chaddock, Mr. J. B. Smith; *Isabella*, Mrs. Douglas Nelson; *Jackson*, Mrs. Mary Lathrop, Fidus Livermore; *Kalamazoo*, J. H. Stone, Col. F. W. Curtenius, Merritt Moore. Dr. N. Thomas; *Kent*, Mrs. E. L. Briggs, E. G. D. Holden, E. P. Churchill; *Lapeer*, Hon. J. C. Lamb, Mrs. J. B. Wilson; *Lenawee*, Mrs. Dr. Fox, Mrs. F. A. Rowley, Hon. Charles E. Mickley; *Livingston*, E. P. Gregory; *Macomb*, Mrs. Ambrose Campbell, Daniel B. Briggs; *Manistee*, S. W. Fowler, Hon. B. M. Cutcheon, T. J. Ramsdell; *Marquette*, Sidney Adams, Hiram A. Burt; *Mason*, Mr. Foster; *Midland*, Dr. E. Jennings, Mrs. Sumner; *Missaukee*, S. W. Davis; *Monroe*, Hon. J. J. Sumner; *Montcalm*, Mr. J. M. Fuller; *Muskegon*, Lieutenant-Governor H. H. Holt, Mrs. O. B. Ingersoll, Mrs. Barney; *Newaygo*, Hon. E. L. Gray, Mrs. Lucy Utley; *Oakland*, Mrs. D. B. Fox, J. Holman, jr., Mrs. Alexander; *Oceana*, John Halsted; *Osceola*, B. F. Gooch; *Ottawa*, Dwight Cutler, Mrs. W. C. Sheldon; *Roscommon*, Messrs. Davis & Hall; *Saginaw*, Mrs. Whiting, Mrs. Gamble, J. F. Driggs, W. P. Burdick; *Shiawassee*, Mrs. Dr. Parkill, J. H. Hartwell, Hon. J. M. Goodell, Dr. King; *St. Clair*, Hon. B. W. Jenks; *St. Joseph*, W. S. Moore, Mrs. Mary Peck; *Tuscola*, Mrs. J. P. Hoyt; *Van Buren*, Mr. and Mrs. C. D. Van Vechten, A. S. Dyckman, Hon. S. H. Blackman; *Washtenaw*, Mrs. Israel Hall, Mrs. Seth Reed, D. Cramer, Mary E. Foster; *Wayne*, Mrs. C. A. F. Stebbins, Colin Campbell, G. W. Bates, Lucy L. Stout.

Digitized by Google

bates, and in reviewing the fundamental principles of our government and religion. Being frequently told that women did not wish to vote, I adopted the plan of calling for a rising vote at the close of my lectures, and on all occasions a majority of the women would promptly rise. Knowing that the men had the responsibility of voting before their eyes, and might be diffident about rising, I reversed the manner of expression in their case, requesting all those in favor of woman suffrage to keep their seats, and those opposed to rise up, thus throwing the onerous duty of changing their attitudes on the opposition. So few arose under such circumstances that it was somewhat embarrassing for those who did.

Those who were engaged in the canvass* had enthusiastic meetings everywhere. They not only filled all their regular appointments, but spoke in the prisons, asylums; even the deaf and dumb were refreshed with the gospel of woman suffrage. The press, too, was generally favorable, though the opposition magnified the occasional adverse criticisms out of all proportion to their severity and number. Towards the last of September Miss Anthony, by invitation of Mrs. Briggs and Mrs. Bliss of Grand Rapids, came into the State and remained until election day. She often brought down the house with her witty comments on the criticisms of the press.†

Everything that could be done was done by the friends of the amendment throughout the State; meetings held and tracts on every phase of the question scattered in all the most obscure settlements; inspiring songs sung, earnest prayers offered, the press vigilant in its appeals, and on election day women everywhere at the polls, persuading voters to cast their ballots for temperance, moral purity and good order, to be secured only by giving the right of suffrage to their mothers, wives and daughters. But the sun went down, the polls were closed, and in the early dawn of the next morning the women of Michigan learned that their status as citizens of the United States had not been advanced one iota by the liberal action of their governor, their legislature, the appeals of the women nor the votes of 40,000 of the best men of the State.

When the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the national constitution were passed, many advocates of suffrage believed that the right was conferred on women. In a letter to a State convention held at that time, Wendell Phillips said:

The new phase of the woman movement—that claiming the right to vote under the fourteenth amendment—is attracting great attention in Washington. Whether it ever obtains judicial sanction or not, it certainly gives a new and most effective means of agitation. The argument of the minority report, understood to be written by General Butler, is most able. * * * The statement of the argument, and the array of cases

---

* Miss Eastman, Miss Hindman, Phœbe Couzins, Margaret W. Campbell, Elizabeth K. Churchill, Lelia Partridge, Mrs. Hazlett, Mrs. Samms, Miss Matilda Victor; George W. Julian of Indiana, Giles B. Stebbins and Clinton R. Fisk, representing the Michigan Association, and the following among volunteer workers: B. A. Harlan of Grand Rapids, Mrs. Hathaway of Cass county, Mrs. Judge Fuller, the Hon. J. H. McGowan and Mrs. Boutelle of Branch county; Mrs. L. A. Pearsall of Macomb, Mrs. F. W. Gillette of Oakland, Miss Strickland of Clinton, J. B. Stone of Kalamazoo, Mrs. Lucy L. Stout of Wayne, and the Rev. T. H. Stewart of Indiana.

† It was in this campaign that an editor in a Kalamazoo journal said: "That ancient daughter of Methuselah, Susan B. Anthony, passed through our city yesterday, on her way to the Plainwell meeting, with a bonnet on her head looking as if she had recently descended from Noah's ark." Miss Anthony often referred to this description of herself, and said, "Had I represented 20,000 votes in Michigan, that political editor would not have known nor cared whether I was the oldest or the youngest daughter of Methuselah, or whether my bonnet came from the ark or from Worth's.—[E. C. S.

and authorities, are very striking. Nothing more cogent can be imagined or desired. When two years ago a Western advocate of woman's rights started this theory, we never expected to see it assume such importance.

In accordance with this opinion, certain women resolved to apply for registration, and offer their votes. On March 25, 1871, Catherine A. F. Stebbins and Mrs. Nannette B. Gardner of Detroit made the attempt to have their names regularly enrolled as legally qualified voters. Mrs. Stebbins, accompanied by her husband, made application in the fifth ward to have her name registered, but was refused. She then proposed to her friend, Mrs. Gardner, to make the trial in her ward, to which she assented. Accordingly, they went to the first district of the ninth ward, where Peter Hill was the enrolling officer. Mrs. Gardner gave her name, saying she was a "person" within the meaning of the fourteenth amendment, and that she was a widow, and a tax-payer without representation. Mr. Hill, seeing the justice of her demand, entered her name upon the register.

This action took some of the board of registration by surprise, and a motion was made to erase her name, but was decided in the negative.* The board was now asked for a decision in regard to Mrs. Stebbins' name, as the question very naturally suggested itself to the inspectors, if one woman can vote why not another. Mrs. Stebbins was notified that her case would have a hearing. When asked to submit her reasons for demanding the right to vote, Mrs. S. stated that she asked it simply as the right of a human being under the constitution of the United States. She had paid taxes on personal and real estate, and had conformed to the laws of the land in every respect. Since the fourteenth amendment had enfranchised woman as well as the black man, she had the necessary qualifications of an elector.

A long debate followed. Inspectors Bagg, Hill and Folsom argued in favor of the petitioner; Allison, Brooks, Henderson and Hughes against. The opposition confessed that the negro had voted before the word "white" had been expunged from the State constitution; but that was done from a "political necessity." The question of acceptance being put to vote, was negatived—13 to 10. This was counted a victory, and stimulated the opposition to make another effort to strike Mrs. Gardner's name from the register; but failing in that, the board adjourned. There was now much curiosity to know if Alderman Hill would have the nerve to stand by his initiative; but with him the Rubicon was passed, and on April 3, Messrs. Hill and Durfee accepted Mrs. Gardner's vote, Mr. Bond protesting. The Detroit *Post* gave the following account:

Mrs. Gardner arrived at the polls of the first precinct of the ninth ward at about half-past ten o'clock in a carriage, accompanied by her son, a lad of ten years, Mrs. Starring and Mrs. Giles B. Stebbins. Barely a dozen by-standers were present, and the larger part of these were laboring men. No demonstration followed the appearance of the ladies, the men remaining quiet, and contenting themselves with comments *sotto voce* on this last political development, and with speculations as to how the newly enfranchised would vote. Mrs. Gardner presented herself at the polls with a vase of

* The inspectors voting were: *Yeas*—Adams, Baxter, Brooks, Dullea, Henderson, Smith. *Nays*—Bragg, Balch, Barclay, Barry, Bond, Christian, Hill, Hughes, Langley, Mahoney, O'Keefe, Sutherland.

flowers and also a prepared ballot, which she had decorated with various appropriate devices. The inspectors asked the questions usually put to all applicants, and her name being found duly registered, her ballot was received and deposited in the box. There was no argument, no challenge, no variation from the routine traversed by each masculine exerciser of the elective franchise. Mrs. Gardner voted, as we understand, for the Republican candidates generally, with one Democrat and one lady.

At Battle Creek, Mrs. Mary Wilson voted at the election of 1871. When she registered, she was accompanied by her lawyer.

In the fall of 1872, Peter Hill again registered Mrs. Gardner, and received her vote. Mr. Hill had been exposed to many animadversions for his persistence, and as an acknowledgment of her appreciation of his course, Mrs. Gardner presented him a silk banner suitably inscribed. A city paper gives this account of it:

Mrs. Gardner, who has for years been a recognized voter in the ninth ward of Detroit, again voted on Tuesday. She came on foot, with Mrs. Stebbins, in a drenching rain, as no carriage could be obtained. After voting, she presented a beautiful banner of white satin, trimmed with gold fringe, on which was inscribed, "A Woman's Voting Hymn." The reverse side, of blue silk, contained the dedication: "To Peter Hill, Alderman of the Ninth Ward, Detroit. First to Register a Woman's Vote. By recognizing civil liberty and equality for woman, he has placed the last and brightest jewel on the brow of Michigan."

The city board now felt called upon to pass a vote of censure upon Mr. Hill's action. The record runs thus:

Canvasser BAXTER: *Resolved*, That the act of the inspectors of election of the first district of the ninth ward, in receiving the vote of Mrs. Nannette B. Gardner at the election just passed, is emphatically disapproved by this board, on the ground that said act is a plain violation of the election laws and constitution of the State of Michigan, and is liable to lead to the grossest abuses and complications.

Canvasser FULDA moved to lay the resolution on the table—lost. Adopted as follows: *Yeas*—Langley, Flower, House, Lichtenberg, Phelps, Parsons, Christian, Allison, Buehle, Dullea, Daly, Barbier, Baxter—13. *Nays*—Wooley and Fulda—2.

CHAS. A. BORGMAN, *Secretary.* PHILO PARSONS, *Chairman.*

Mrs. Stebbins attempted to register at this election with the same result as before. Upon the fourth of November she provided herself with a sworn statement that she had been "wrongfully prevented" the record of her name, and offered her vote at the polls, calling attention to the "enforcing act," provided for such cases. It had no terror, however, for the valiant inspectors of the fifth ward. In the fall of 1873, there was the following correspondence between the board and the city counselor:

Hon. D. C. Holbrook, City Counselor: DEAR SIR:—Mrs. Giles B. Stebbins has applied to this board and demands the right to register. This board has declined to grant the request on the ground that it does not believe her to be a legal elector. Mrs. Stebbins would have all the required qualifications of an elector, but for the fact of her being a woman, and we therefore respectfully request that you instruct us as to our duty in the premises. Very respectfully, S. B. WOOLLEY,

ALBERT BOTSFORD,

Inspectors of First Ward.

Woman cannot be enrolled or registered. Let her try it on.*

Oct. 24, 1873. D. C. HOLBROOK, *City Counselor.*

* We can easily see how little the opponents who talk so much of chivalry, respect women or themselves, by the language they use when they are opposed on this very question.

In company with Mrs. H. J. Boutelle, Mrs. Stebbins offered her vote in the fifth ward. Mr. Farwell was in favor of receiving it, and wished to leave the question to a dozen responsible citizens whom he called in as referees, but Col. Phelps would not be influenced by the judgment of outsiders, and would not agree to the proposal.*

Mrs. Gardner's name was retained on the ward voting list, and she voted every year until she left the city for the education of her children.

Before the University at Ann Arbor was opened to girls in 1869, there had been several attempts to establish seminaries for girls alone.† But they were not successful for several reasons. As the State would not endow these private institutions, it made the education of daughters very expensive, and fathers with daughters, seeing their neighbors' sons in the State University educated at the public expense, from financial considerations were readily converted to the theory of coëducation. Again the general drift of thought was in favor of coëducation throughout the young western States. Then institutions of learning were too expensive to build separate establishments for girls and boys, and the number of boys able to attend through a collegiate course could not fill the colleges ready for their reception. Hence from all considerations it was a double advantage both to the State and the girls, to admit them to the universities.

James A. B. Stone and Mrs. Lucinda H. Stone went to Kalamazoo in 1843, immediately after his election to take charge of the Literary Institute. The name was afterwards changed to Kalamazoo College. It is the oldest collegiate institute in the State, having been chartered in 1833, and was designed from the outset for both sexes. In the beginning it did not confer degrees, but was the first, after Oberlin, to give diplomas to women. Kalamazoo was an object of derision with some of the professors of the University, because it was, they averred, of doubtful gender. But a liberal-minded public grew more and more in favor of epicene colleges. Literary seminaries had been established for coëducation at Albion, Olivet, Adrian and Hillsdale, but some of their charters were not exactly of a collegiate grade, and it was doubtful whether under the new constitution, new college charters would be granted, so that Kalamazoo and Ann Arbor had the field. In January, 1845, a bill was introduced in the legislature to organize literary institutions under a general law, no collegiate degrees being allowed, unless on the completion of a curriculum equal to that of the State University. The championship of this bill fell to Dr. Stone, for while it would have no special effect on Kalamazoo, it concerned the cause of coëducation in the State, and the friends of the University made it a kind of test of what the State policy should be in reference to the higher learning for women. Dr. Tappan, then the able president of the University, appeared at Lansing, supported by Rev. Dr.

* Mrs. Boutelle and Mrs. Stebbins were in the polling place two or three hours, while Mr. Farwell made efforts to gain favorable opinions enough to convert Colonel Phelps; many excellent men were in favor of her vote. The ladies lunched from a daintily filled basket, prepared by the wife of inspector Farwell.

† Miss Abby Rogers, Miss Delia Rogers, Miss Emily Ward, and Miss Clapp, were all deeply interested in establishing a seminary where girls could have equal advantages with students in the university. This seminary was in existence ten years, but without State aid the struggle was too great, and Miss Abby Rogers, the founder, abandoned the undertaking.

Digitized by Google

Duffield and a force of able lawyers, to oppose it, and the far-seeing friends of education in the legislature and in the lobby, rallied with Dr. Stone for its support. For several weeks the contest was carried on with earnestness, almost with bitterness, before the legislative committees, before public meetings called in the capitol for discussion, and on the floor of both houses. Dr. Tappan made frantic appeals to Michigan statesmen not to disgrace the State by such a law, which he prophesied would result in "preparatory schools for matrimony," and, shocking to contemplate, young men would marry their classmates. Among the friends of the measure present, were President Fairfield, Professor Hosford, and Hon. Mr. Edsell, of Otsego, all graduates of Oberlin, who had married their classmates, and "been glad ever since." They replied, "What of it? Are not those who have met daily in the recitation-room for four years, as well prepared to judge of each other's fitness for life-companionship, as if they had only met a few times at a ball, a dress party, or in private interview?" The legislature was an intelligent one, and the bill passed amid great excitement, crowds of interested spectators listening to the final discussions in the lower House. Governor Bingham was friendly to the bill from the first. After its passage, he sent a handsome copy signed by himself and other officers, to Dr. and Mrs. Stone, at Kalamazoo, to be preserved as a record of the Thermopylæ fight for coëducation in Michigan.

Rev. E. O. Havens succeeded Dr. Tappan in the presidency, and was supposed to be less strong in his prejudices, but when efforts were made to open the doors to both sexes, he reported it difficult and inexpedient, if not impossible. But he counted without the broad-minded people of Michigan. A growing conviction that the legislature would stop the appropriations to the University unless justice was done to the daughters of the State, finally brought about, at Ann Arbor, a change of policy. Under the light that broke in upon their minds, the professors found there was really no law against the admission of women to that very liberal seat of learning. "To be sure, they never had admitted women, but none had formally applied." This, though somewhat disingenuous, was received in good faith, and soon tested by Miss Madeline Stockwell, who had completed half her course at Kalamazoo, and was persuaded by Mrs. Stone to make application at Ann Arbor. Mrs. Stone knew her to be a thorough scholar, as far as she had gone, especially in Greek, which some had supposed that women could not master. When she presented herself for examination some members of the faculty were far from cordial, but they were just, and she entered in the grade for which she applied. She sustained herself ably in all her studies, and when examined for her degree—the first woman graduate from the literary department—she was commended as the peer of any of her class-mates, and took an honorable part in the commencement exercises. Moreover, she fulfilled the doleful prophecy of Dr. Tappan, as women in other schools had done before her, and married her class-mate, Mr. Turner, an able lawyer.

The statement by the faculty, or regents, that "no woman had formally applied," was untrue, as we shall see. The University was opened to them in 1869; eleven years before, Miss Sarah Burger, now Mrs. Stearns, made

the resolve, the preparation, and the application to enter the University of Michigan; and young as she was, her clear-sightedness and courage called forth our admiration. As a child, in Ann Arbor, from 1845, to 1852, she had often attended the commencement exercises of the University, and on those occasions had felt very unhappy, because all the culture given to mind and heart and soul by this institution was given to young men alone. It seemed a cruel injustice to young women that they could not be there with their brothers, enjoying the same. In connection with her efforts and those of her friends to enter those enchanted portals, she bears grateful testimony to the discussions on the question of woman's rights, as follows:

When it was my blessed privilege to attend a women's rights convention at Cleveland, Ohio, in 1853,—and it was a grand meeting—where dear Lucretia Mott, Ernestine L. Rose, Frances D. Gage, Antoinette Brown, Lucy Stone, and others, dwelt upon the manifold wrongs suffered by women, and called upon them to awake and use their powers to secure justice to all, I felt their words to mean that the Michigan University as well as all others, should be opened to girls, and that women themselves should first move in the matter.

Thus aroused, though but sixteen years old, she resolved at once to make application for admission to the State University. Early in the autumn of 1856, she entered the high school at Ann Arbor, and studied Greek and Latin two years, preparatory to taking the classical course. Four young ladies besides herself, recited with the boys who were preparing for college, and they were all declared by a university professor who had attended frequent examinations, to stand head and shoulders in scholarship above many of the young men. Miss Burger wishing as large a class as possible to appeal for admission, wrote to a number of classical schools for young women, asking coöperation, and secured the names of eleven* who would gladly apply with her. In the spring of 1858, she sent a note to the regents, saying a class of twelve young ladies would apply in June, for admission to the University in September. A reporter said "a certain Miss B. had sent the regents warning of the momentous event." At the board meeting in June, the young ladies presented their promised letter of application, and received as reply, that the board should have *more time to consider*. In September their reply was, that it seemed inexpedient for the University to admit ladies at present. In the meantime, a great deal had been said and done on the subject; some members of the faculty had spoken in favor, some against. University students, and citizens of Ann Arbor also joined in the general discussion. The subject was widely discussed in the press and on the platform; members of the faculty and board of regents applied to the presidents of universities east and west, for their opinions. The people of Michigan, thus brought to consider the injustice of the exclusion of their daughters from this State institution, there was offered for signature during the winter of 1859, the following petition:

To the Regents of the University of Michigan:

The undersigned, inhabitants of ————, in the county of ————, and State of Michigan, respectfully request that young women may be admitted as students in

* The names of the eleven young women Mrs. Stearns is unable to recall.

Digitized by Google

the University, for the following among other reasons: *First*—It is incumbent on the State to give equal educational advantages to both sexes. *Second*—All can be educated in the State University with but little more expense than is necessary to educate young men alone. *Third*—It will save the State from the expenditure of half a million of dollars, necessary to furnish young ladies in a separate institution with the advantages now enjoyed by young men. *Fourth*—It will admit young ladies at once to the benefits of the highest educational privileges of the State.

Among the most active in lectures, debates, circulation of petitions and general advocacy were James B. Gott, Judge Edwin Lawrence, Giles B. Stebbins and O. P. Stearns, the last at that time a student, since a lawyer, and the husband of Mrs. Sarah Burger Stearns of Minnesota.

In the spring of 1859 formal application was again made to the regents by a class of young ladies, only to receive the same answer. But the discussion was not dropped; indeed, that was impossible. Some of the most intelligent on this question believe that the final admission of women to the University was due to a resolve on the part of the people of the State to place upon the board of regents, as the terms of old members expired, men well known to be favorable. On the election of Professor Estabrook of the State Normal School there was one more noble man "for us," who, with other new members, made a majority in favor of justice. In the autumn of that year (1869) young women were admitted to full privileges in Michigan University, and, like political freedom in Wyoming, it has for years been confessed to have yielded only beneficent results. As long ago, however, as the first application was made (1858) women were permitted to attend certain lectures. They could not join a class or read a book, but it was the custom for them to go and listen to the beautiful and highly instructive lectures by Professor Andrew D. White on history, sculpture, and mediæval architecture, and they highly appreciated the privilege.

In March, 1869, President Havens said in the House of Representatives at Lansing, "he believed the University should be opened to those who desired to obtain the benefit of the branches of education which they could not obtain elsewhere." The Rev. Gilbert Haven wrote to the American Society's meeting held in Detroit, in 1874: "I have been identified with your cause through its evil report, and, I was going to add, good report, but that part has not yet very largely set in. I also had the honor to preside over the first ecclesiastical body that has, just now, pronounced in your favor." This church assembly was the Methodist State Association, which adopted the following in October, 1874, without a negative vote, though several of the delegates refused to vote:

WHEREAS, The legislature of Michigan, at its recent session, has submitted to the electors of the State a proposition to change the State constitution so as to admit the women of Michigan to the elective franchise; therefore,

Resolved, That this convention recognizes the action of the legislature as a step toward a higher and purer administration of the government of our country, and we hope the provision will be adopted.

But the above was not the strongest utterance of Bishop Gilbert Haven. Once at an equal rights society convention in the Academy of Music, Brooklyn, where from floor to ceiling was gathered an admirable and immense audience, with profound respect I heard these memorable words:

"I shall never be satisfied until a *black woman* is seated in the presidential chair of the United States," than which no more advanced claim for the complete legal recognition of woman has been made in our country.

In February, 1879, a spirited debate took place in the legislature upon an amendment to the Episcopal Church bill, which struck out the word "male" from the qualification of voters. The Detroit *Post and Tribune* says a vigorous effort was made to defeat the measure, but without success. The justice of allowing women to take part in church government was recognized, and the amendment carried.

We have written persistently to leading women all over the State for facts in regard to their local societies, and such responses as have been received are embodied in this chapter. We give interesting reports of a few of the county societies in which much has been accomplished.

Of the work in Quincy Mrs. Sarah Turner says:

We never organized a woman suffrage society, although our literary club has done much for the cause in a general way. We had crowded houses on the occasions of a very able speech from Elizabeth Cady Stanton and a most spirited one from Miss Phœbe Couzins. For the past eight years a dozen tax-paying women of this town have availed themselves of the privilege granted them years ago, and voted at the school meetings; and two years ago a woman was elected member of the school-board.

Lansing reports for January, 1871, Mrs. Livermore's lecture on "The Reasons Why" [women should be enfranchised]; the organization of a city society with sixty members at the close of the annual meeting of the State Association held in that city in March; a lecture from Mrs. Stanton before the Young Men's Association; the adoption of a declaration of rights by the Ingham County Society, March, 1872, signed by 169 of the best people of the county. In 1874, of the many meetings held those of Mrs. Stanton and Miss Couzins are specially mentioned.

The St. Johns society, formed in 1872 with six members, reported sixty at the State annual meeting of 1874, and also $171.71, raised by fees and sociables, mainly expended in the circulation of tracts and documents throughout the county.

From Manistee Mrs. Fannie Holden Fowler writes:

In the campaign of 1874 Hon. S. W. Fowler, one of the committee for Northern Michigan appointed by the State Society, canvassed Manistee county and advocated the cause through his paper, the *Times and Standard*. The election showed the good of educational work, as a large vote was polled in the towns canvassed by Mr. Fowler, two of them giving a majority for the amendment. In an editorial, after the election, Mr. Fowler said: "The combined forces of ignorance, vice and prejudice have blocked the wheels of advancing civilization, and Michigan, once the proudest of the sisterhood of States, has lost the opportunity of inaugurating a reform; now let the women organize for a final onset." However, no active suffrage work was done until December 3, 1879, when Susan B. Anthony was induced to stop over on her way from Frankfort to Ludington and give her lecture, "Woman Wants Bread; Not the Ballot." She was our guest, and urged the formation of a society, and through her influence a "Woman's Department" was added to the *Times and Standard*, which is still a feature of the paper. In the following spring (April, 1880), Elizabeth Cady Stanton gave her lecture, "Our Girls," with two "conversations," before the temperance women and others, which revived the courage of the few who had been considering the question of organization. A call was issued, to which twenty-three responded, and the society was formed June 8, 1880,* adopting the constitution of the National and elect-

* The officers of the Manistee Society are (1885): *President*, Mrs. Lucy T. Stansell; *Corresponding Secretary*, Fannie Holden Fowler; *Recording Secretary*, Miss Nellie Walker; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Susan Seymour.

Digitized by Google

ing delegates to attend a convention to be held under the auspices of that association the following week at Grand Rapids. The society at once made a thorough canvass of the city, which resulted in the attendance of seventy tax-paying women at the school election in September, when the first woman's vote was cast in Manistee county. Each succeeding year has witnessed more women at the school election, until, in 1883, they outnumbered the men, and would have elected their ticket but for a fraud perpetrated by the old school-board, which made the election void.

In August 1881, Mrs. May Wright Sewall delivered two lectures in Manistee. In February 1882, a social, celebrating Miss Anthony's birthday, was given by the association at the residence of Mr. and Mrs. Fowler, and was voted a success. Through the untiring efforts of Mrs. Lucy T. Stansell, who was also a member of the Ladies' Lever League, Mrs. Elizabeth Boynton Harbert gave a Manistee audience a rich treat in her "Homes of Representative Women," and her conversation on suffrage elicited much interest.

During the autumn of 1882, petitions asking for municipal suffrage were circulated. The venerable Josiah R. Holden of Grand Rapids, father of Mrs. Fowler, then in his 88th year, obtained the largest number of signatures to his petition of any one in the State. A bill granting municipal suffrage to women was drawn by Mrs. Fowler, introduced in the legislature by Hon. George J. Robinson, and afterwards tabled. At the session of 1885 a similar bill came within a few votes of being carried.

In Grand Rapids there was no revival of systematic work until 1880, when the National Association held a very successful two days' convention in the city. In response to a petition from the society, the legislature in the winter of 1885 passed a law, giving to the tax-paying women of the city the right to vote on school questions at the charter elections. At the first meeting a hundred women were present, and hundreds availed themselves of their new power and voted at the first election.

The State Society held its annual meeting at Grand Rapids, October 7, 8, 9, 1885, at which the address of welcome was given by Mrs. Loraine Immen, president of the City Society,* and responded to by Mrs. Stebbins of Detroit.†

The only religious sect in the world, unless we except the Quakers, that has recognized the equality of woman, is the Spiritualists. They have always assumed that woman may be a medium of communication from heaven to earth, that the spirits of the universe may breathe through her lips messages of loving kindness and mercy to the children of earth. The Spiritualists in our country are not an organized body, but they are more or less numerous in every State and Territory from ocean to ocean. Their opinions on woman suffrage and equal rights in all respects must be learned from the utterances of their leading speakers and writers of books, from their weekly journals, from resolutions passed at large meetings, and from their usage and methods. A reliable person widely familiar with Spiritualism since its beginning in 1848, says that he has known but very few Spiritualists who were not in favor

* The officers of the Grand Rapids Society are: *President*, Mrs. Cordelia F. Briggs; *Vice-Presidents*, Loraine Immen, Emma Wheeler; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Henry Spring; *Secretary*, Mrs. J. W. Adams.

† Following is a complete list of all officers elected in 1885: *President*, Mrs. Mary L. Doe of Carrollton; *Vice-President*, Mrs. Loraine Immen of Grand Rapids; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. H. S. Spring of Grand Rapids; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Fannie H. Fowler of Manistee; *Treasurer*, Mrs. C. A. F. Stebbins of Detroit; *Advisory Committee*, Mrs. E. L. Briggs of Grand Rapids, and Mrs. S. E. V. Emery of Lansing; *Executive Committee*—First District, Mrs. Harriet J. Boutell of Detroit; Second District, Mrs. Annette B. Gardner Smith of Ann Arbor; Fifth District, Mrs. Emily H. Ketchum of Grand Rapids; Sixth District, Francis M. Stuart of Flint; Eighth District, Mrs. Frances C. Stafford of Milwaukee; Ninth District, Col. S. W. Fowler of Manistee; Eleventh and Twelfth Districts, Mrs. R. A. Campbell, Traverse City.

of woman suffrage; that all their representative men and women, and all their journals advocate it, and have always done so; that expressions in its favor in public meetings meet with hearty approval, and that men and women have spoken on their platforms, and held official places as co-workers in their societies through all of these thirty-seven years. All this has taken place with very little argument or discussion, but from an intuitive sense of the justice and consequent benefits of such a course. A single testimony, of many that might be given from their writings, must suffice. In the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, Chicago, Ill., November 22, 1884, its editor, J. C. Bundy, says: "Although not especially published in the interest of woman, this journal is a stalwart advocate of woman's rights, and has for years given weekly space to 'Woman and the Household,' a department under the care of Mrs. Hester M. Poole, who has done much to encourage women to renewed and persistent effort for their own advancement."

It has been the custom of some of our journals to ask for letters of greeting from distinguished people for New Year's day. We find the following in the *Inter-Ocean:* "Sojourner Truth, the Miriam of the later Exodus, sends us this remarkable letter. She is the most wonderful woman the colored race has ever produced, and thus conveys her New Year's greeting to our readers:

"DEAR FRIENDS: More than a hundred New Years have I seen before this one, and I send a New Year's greeting to one and all. We talk of a beginning, but there is no beginning but the beginning of a wrong. All else is from God, and is from everlasting to everlasting. All that has a beginning will have an ending. God is without end, and all that is good is without end. We shall never see God, only as we see him in one another. He is a great ocean of love, and we live and move in Him as the fishes in the sea, filled with His love and spirit, and His throne is in the hearts of His people. Jesus, the Son of God, will be as we are, if we are pure, and we will be like him. There will be no distinction. He will be like the sun and shine upon us, and we will be like the sun and shine upon him; all filled with glory. We are the children of one Father, and he is God; and Jesus will be one among us. God is no respecter of persons, and we will be as one. If it were not so, there would be jealousy. These ideas have come to me since I was a hundred years old, and if you, my friends, live to be a hundred years old, too, you may have greater ideas than these. This has become a new world. These thoughts I speak of because they come to me, and for you to consider and look at. We should grow in wisdom as we grow older, and new ideas will come to us about God and ourselves, and we will get more and more the wisdom of God. I am glad to be remembered by you, and to be able to send my thoughts, hoping they may multiply and bear fruit. If I should live to see another New Year'a Day I hope to be able to send more new thoughts. SOJOURNER TRUTH.

"*Grand Rapids, Mich.*, Dec. 26, 1880."

This was accompanied by a note from her most faithful friend, Mrs. Frances W. Titus, relating matters of interest as to her present circumstances. She also said: "We have recently another proof that she is over one hundred years old. Mention of the 'dark day' May 19, 1780, was made in her presence, when she said, 'I remember the dark day'; and gave a description of that wonderful phenomenon. As the narrative of Sojourner's life has long been before the public, we prefer to anything this latest thought of hers, standing then on the verge of the life of the spirit."

Digitized by Google

Sojourner was long a resident and laborer in reform in Michigan, from which State she went out to the District of Columbia to befriend her people, as well as to other distant fields. She went to help feed and clothe the refugees in Kansas in 1879-80, and in reaching one locality she rode nearly a hundred miles in a lumber wagon. She closed her eventful life in Battle Creek, where she passed her last days, having reached the great age of one hundred and ten years.

Mrs. Laura C. Haviland is another noble woman worthy of mention. She has given a busy life to mitigating the miseries of the unfortunate. She helped many a fugitive to elude the kidnappers; she nursed the suffering soldiers, fed the starving freedmen, following them into Kansas,* and traveled thousands of miles with orphan children to find them places in western homes. She and her husband at an early day opened a manual-labor school, beginning by taking nine children from the county-house, to educate them with their own on a farm near Adrian. Out of her repeated experiments, and petitions to the legislature for State aid, grew at last the State school for homeless children at Coldwater, where for years she gave her services to train girls in various industries.

Mrs. Sybil Lawrence, a woman of strong character, and charming social qualities, exerted a powerful influence for many years in Ann Arbor. Being in sympathy with the suffrage movement, and in favor of coëducation, she did all in her power to make the experiment a success, by her aid and counsels to the girls who first entered the University. Her mother, sister, and nieces made a charming household of earnest women ready for every good work. Their services in the war were indispensable, and their sympathies during the trying period of reconstruction were all on the side of liberty and justice.

There are many other noble women in Michigan worthy of mention did space permit, such as Miss Emily Ward, a woman of remarkable force of character and great benevolence; Mrs. Lucy L. Stout, who has written many beautiful sentiments in prose and verse: Eliza Legget and Florence Mayhew, identified with all reform movements; Mrs. Tenney, the State librarian; and Mrs. Euphemia Cochrane, a Scotch woman by birth, who loved justice and liberty, a staunch friend alike of the slave and the unfortunate of her own sex. Under her roof the advocates of abolition and woman suffrage always found a haven of rest. Henry C. Wright, Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd Garrison, Sojourner Truth, Theodore Tilton, Frederick Douglass, Abbey Kelley and Stephen Foster could all bear testimony to her generous and graceful hospitality. She was president of the Detroit Woman Suffrage Association at the time she passed from earth to a higher life.

---

* Spending the summer of 1865 at Leavenworth, I frequently visited Mrs. Haviland, then busily occupied in ministering to the necessities of the 10,000 refugees just then from the Southern States. On May 29, I aided her in collecting provisions for the steamer, which was to transport over a hundred men, women and children, for whom she was to provide places in Michigan. I shall never forget that day nor the admiration and reverence I felt for the magnanimity and self-sacrifice of that wonderful woman.—[S. B. A.

CHAPTER XLII.

INDIANA.

The First Woman Suffrage Convention After the War, 1869—Amanda M. Way—Annual Meetings, 1870–85, in the Larger Cities—Indianapolis Equal Suffrage Society, 1878—A Course of Lectures—In May, 1880, National Convention in Indianapolis—Zerelda G. Wallace—Social Entertainment—Governor Albert G. Porter—Susan B. Anthony's Birthday—Schuyler Colfax—Legislative Hearings—Temperance Women of Indiana—Helen M. Gougar—General Assembly—Delegates to Political Conventions—Women Address Political Meetings—Important Changes in the Laws for Women, from 1860 to 1884—Colleges Open to Women—Demia Butler—Professors—Lawyers—Doctors—Ministers—Miss Catherine Merrill—Miss Elizabeth Eaglesfield—Rev. Prudence Le Clerc—Dr. Mary F. Thomas—Prominent Men nnd Women—George W. Julian—The Journals—Gertrude Garrison.

THIS was one of the first States to form a Woman Suffrage Society * for thoroughly organized action, with a president, secretary, treasurer, and constitution and by-laws. From October, 1851, this association held annual meetings, sent petitions and appeals to the legislature, and had frequent hearings at the capitol, diligently pressing the question of political equality for woman for ten consecutive years. Then, although the society did not disband, we find no record of meetings or aggressive action until 1869, for here, as elsewhere, all other interests were forgotten in the intense excitement of a civil war. But no sooner were the battles fought, victory achieved, and the army disbanded, than woman's protests against her wrongs were heard throughout the Northern States; and in Indiana the same Amanda M. Way who took the iniative step in 1851 for the first woman's convention, summoned her coädjutors once more to action in 1869,† and with the same platform and officers renewed the work with added determination for a final victory.

---

* See Vol. I., page 306.

† The call for this convention was signed by Amanda M. Way, Mrs. M. C. Bland, Mrs. M. M. B. Goodwin, Mrs. Henry Blanchard, Mrs. Emma B. Swank, Indianapolis; Mrs. Isaac Kinley, Richmond; Dr. Mary F. Thomas, Camden; Dr. Mary H. Wilhite, Miss Lizzie Boynton, Miss Mollie Krout, Dr. E. E. Barrett, Crawfordsville; Mrs. Abula Pucket Nind, Fort Wayne; Mrs. L. S. Bidell, Crown Point; Rev. E. P. Ingersoll, J. V. R. Miller, Rev. Henry Blanchard, Rev. William Hannaman, Professor A. C. Shortridge, Professor R. T. Brown, Professor Thomas Rhodes, Dr. T. A. Bland, Indianapolis; Hon. Isaac Kinley, Isaac H. Julian, Richmond; Hon. L. M. Nind, Fort Wayne; Hon. S. T. Montgomery, Kokomo; D. R. Pershing and Rev. T. Sells, Warsaw.

Digitized by Google

For this interesting chapter we are indebted to Mrs. May Wright Sewall, who has patiently gathered and arranged this material, and laid it, as a free gift, at our feet. Those who have ever attempted to unearth the most trivial incidents of history, will appreciate the difficulties she must have encountered in this work, as well as in condensing all she desired to say within the very limited space allowed to this chapter. Mrs. Sewall writes:

The first convention after the war, June 8, 9, 1869, was held in Masonic Hall, and continued two days. The Indianapolis *Journal* devoted several columns daily to the proceedings, closing with the following complimentary editorial:

As a deliberative assembly it compared favorably with the best that have ever been conducted by our own sex. To say that there was as much order, propriety and dignity as usually characterizes male conventions of a political character is but to put the matter in a very mild shape. Whatever was said, was said with earnestness and for a purpose, and while several times the debate was considerably spiced, the ladies never fell below their brothers in sound sense. We have yet to see any sensible man who attended the convention whose esteem for woman has been lowered, while very many have been converted by the captivating speeches of Mrs. Cole, Mrs. Swank and Mrs. Livermore.

In the *Sentinel* of June 11, 1869, an editorial appeared whose evident object was to reassure the public mind and to restore to peace and confidence any souls that might have been agitated during the convention by so unusual and novel an exercise as thought. The nature of the sedative potion thus editorially administered to an alarmed public may be inferred from this sample:

No amount of human ingenuity can change the arrangement of nature. The history of the race furnishes the evidence that the species of man and woman are opposite. The distinctions that now exist have existed from the time that the "Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam," and said: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband; he shall rule over thee." This brief story comprises the history of man and woman, and defines the relations which shall ever exist between them. When woman ceases to be womanly, woman's rights associations become her fitting province.

The editor of the *Journal* at that time was Colonel W. R. Holloway, the present very liberal manager of the *Times*. The editor of the *Sentinel* was Joseph J. Bingham. The State was then Republican, and as the organ of that party the *Journal* probably had the larger number of readers.

The State Woman Suffrage Association convened in Indianapolis, June 8, 1870, and held a two days' meeting. The *Journal* contains, as usual, a full report. The *Sentinel's* tone is quite different from that which distinguished its utterances the preceding year. Its reports are full and perfectly respectful. This convention is memorable as that at which the Indiana Society became auxiliary to the American Association. The records show that this union was accomplished by a majority of *one*, the ballot on the proposition standing 15 for and 14 against. As soon as the union was thus effected the following was adopted:

Resolved, That this association is in favor of the union of the National and American Associations as soon as practicable.

On the same day Judge Bradwell of Chicago submitted a resolution favoring the union of the two national societies, which was laid on the table. Of the annual meetings from 1871 to 1878 the Indianapolis papers contain no reports, save the briefest mention of those of 1873–4. From 1878 to 1885 short but fair reports may be found. Since 1870, the conventions of this society * have been held in different towns throughout the State.† The minutes show that the propriety of withdrawing from the American Association and remaining independent was brought before the convention of 1871, under the head of *special business;* that it was decided to postpone action until the next annual meeting, and to make the matter of withdrawal a special order of business, but it does not appear that from that time the subject has ever been broached. At the annual meeting of 1875, held at a time when preparations for celebrating our national centennial were in progress, the following resolution was passed:

Resolved, That we congratulate the voters of the United States on their enjoyment of the right of suffrage, and commend them for the great centenary celebration of the establishment of that right, which they are about to have. But we do earnestly protest against the action of the Indiana legislature by which it made appropriations for that purpose of moneys collected by taxing women's property.

In November, 1878, the ninth annual meeting of the American Association was held in Indianapolis, by invitation from the State Society.‡

In the month of March, 1878, some very mysterious whisperings advertised the fact that there was to be a meeting of the ladies of Indianapolis known to have "advanced ideas" concerning their sex. In response to a secretly circulated summons, there met at No. 18 Circle Hall nine women and one man, who, though not mutually acquainted, were the most courageous of those to whom the call had come. Probably each of the ten often thinks with amusement of the suspicious glances with which they regarded one another. As a participant, I may say that the company had the air of a band of conspirators. Had we convened consciously to plot the ruin of our domestic life, which opponents predict as the result of woman's enfranchisement, we could not have looked more guilty or have moved about with more unnatural stealth. That demeanor I explain as an unconscious tribute to what "Madam Grundy" would have thought had she known of our conclave.

At that meeting one point only was definitely settled; which was, whether the new society should take a name which would conceal from the public its primary object, or one which would clearly advertise it. The honesty of the incipient organization was vindicated by its deciding

* The officers of the State Association in 1883 were: *President*, Dr. Mary F. Thomas: *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. Helen V. Austin, Mrs. S. S. McCain, Mrs. M. V. Berg, Mrs. G. Gifford, Mrs. M. P. Lindsey, Mrs. C. A. P. Smith and Mrs. F. G. Scofield; *Secretary*, Mrs. M. E. M. Price; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. F. M. Adkinson; *Treasurer*, Miss Mary D. Naylor; *State Central Committee*, Mrs. Mary E. Haggart, Mrs. Z. G. Wallace and May Wright Sewall.

† Annual—1871, June 21, 22, Bloomington; 1872, June 5, 6, Dublin; 1873, June 11, 12, Terre Haute; Semi-Annual, November 19, Richmond. Annual—1874, May 28, 29, Fort Wayne; 1875, May 25, 26, Liberty; Semi-Annual, November 23, 24, Winchester. Annual—1876, May 30, 31, Anderson; 1877, September 4, 5, Knightstown; 1878, June 11, 12, Richmond: 1879, May 14, 15, Kokomo; 1880, April 27, 28, Crawfordsville; 1881, June 15, 16, Kokomo; Semi-Annual, October 29, Dublin. Annual—1882, May, Columbus; 1883, June, Logansport; 1884, Kokomo; 1885, November 22, 23, Warsaw.

‡ See Vol. II., page 851.

upon the latter. I do not record in detail the initiative steps of this flourishing society in order to awaken in its members any humiliating memories, but because the fact that ten conscientious, upright persons could thus secretly convene in an obscure room, and that such a question could agitate them for more than two hours, is the best indication that could be given of the conservative atmosphere which enveloped Indianapolis even as late as 1878. The next meeting was appointed for April 2, at the residence of Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace. Notices were inserted in the papers, and in the meantime some pains was taken to secure not only the presence of persons who had not previously been identified with any reform movement, but also that of some well-known friends. It was attended by twenty-six men and women, representing various religious and political parties, most of whom enjoyed the advantages of education and social position, and resulted in a permanent organization under a constitution whose first article is as follows:

This organization shall be known as the Indianapolis Equal Suffrage Society, and shall consist of such men and women as are willing to labor for the attainment of equal rights at the ballot-box for all citizens on the same conditions.

On the principle that that which has some restrictions is most desired, membership was at first hedged about with certain formalities. While most reform organizations welcome as members all who will pay their annual fee and subscribe to the constitution, this society requires that the names of candidates be presented at one meeting and formally balloted on at the next, thus providing a month for consideration. Since 1878 this society * has held forty-three public meetings, and distributed throughout the city several thousand tracts. At intervals the society has engaged speakers from abroad. Miss Anthony gave her "Bread and Ballot" to a large audience in Masonic Hall, and many date their conversion from that evening. Mrs. Stanton has appeared twice under the auspices of the society. On the first occasion it secured for her the court-room in which the upper house of the general assembly was then sitting. Tickets of admission were sent to all the members of both houses. Her lecture on "The Education of Girls," made a profound impression. On her second appearance she spoke in the First Christian Church, on "Boys." For Miss Frances E. Willard, Robert's Park Church was obtained, and thus suffrage principles were presented to a new class of minds. Mrs. J. Ellen Foster spoke on "Women before the Law," in the Criminal-court room. The society made every effort to secure the general attendance of members of the bar. Before one of its regular meetings in the Christian chapel, Mrs. Louise V. Boyd read a very bright paper on "A Cheerful Outlook for Women." At its present parlors, Mrs. Harbert delivered an address for the benefit of the suffrage campaign in Oregon.

* The Equal Suffrage Society has now, 1885, a membership of 175, including many representatives of whatever in Indianapolis is best in character, culture and social place. The society has lately districted the city for local work, assuming the boundaries of the school districts as its own for this purpose; its present plan is to place each of these twenty-six districts under the especial care of a committee whose business shall be to hold meetings, distribute literature and circulate petitions. The society thus hopes to create a stimulating suffrage atmosphere at the capital which shall inspire the legislators with courage to do good work for women at their next session.

In May, 1880, this society invited the National Association to hold its annual convention in Indianapolis. Entertainment was provided for eighty-seven delegates, besides the friends who came from different parts of the State. In Park Theatre, the largest auditorium of the city, eloquent voices for two days pleaded the cause of freedom. The reports in the city press were full and fair, and the editorials commendatory. The fact that the *Sentinel* contained a long editorial advocating the doctrines of equal suffrage, shows the progress since 1869. The evening after the convention a reception was given to the members and friends of the National Association in the spacious parlors of Mrs. John C. New.

From its origin the Indianapolis society has held aloof from all formal alliances. Thus it has been free to work with individuals and organizations that have woman suffrage for their aim. It habitually sends delegates to the State annual conventions, and in those of the American and National it is usually represented.

In December, 1880, the society issued a letter, secured its publication in the leading papers of the State, and addressed a copy to each member of the General Assembly, in order to advise that body that there were women ready to watch their official careers and to demand from them the consideration of just claims:

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 22, 1880.

DEAR SIR: The Equal Suffrage Society of Indianapolis, in behalf of citizens of Indiana who believe that liberty to exercise the right of suffrage should neither be granted nor denied on the ground of sex, would respectfully notify you that during the next session of the State legislature it will invite the attention of that body to the consideration of what is popularly called "The Suffrage Question." The society will petition the legislature to devote a day to hearing, from representative advocates of woman suffrage, appeals and arguments for such legislation as may be necessary to abolish the present unjust restriction of the elective franchise to one sex, and to secure to women the free exercise of the ballot, under the same conditions and such only, as are imposed upon men. To this matter we ask your unprejudiced attention, that when our cause shall be brought before the legislature its advocates may have your coöperation. Very respectfully yours, ZERELDA G. WALLACE, *President.*

MAY WRIGHT SEWALL, *Secretary.*

By order of the Equal Suffrage Society of Indianapolis.

The society has lately taken a new departure, giving lunches, parties and literary entertainments, to which invitations* are issued, by the officers, thus becoming a factor in the social life of the city. The invitation, programme, and press comments of its last entertainment indicate the character of these reünions, and the esteem in which they are held. These occasions have been the means of securing for the society greater popular favor than it has hitherto enjoyed. At the conclusion of the

* INVITATION.—The Indianapolis Equal Suffrage Society requests the pleasure of your company at a literary and social entertainment to be given in the Bates House parlors, Friday evening, November 4, 1881. *Committee*—May Wright Sewall, Mary C. Raridan, Mrs H. G. Carey, Mrs. Charles Kregelo, and Miss Lydia Halley. Please present invitation at the door.

PROGRAMME.—1. Music, piano solo, Miss Dietrich; 2. Toast, Yorktown, Henry D. Pierce; 3. Toast, The True Republic, Mrs. Z. G. Wallace; 4. Music, solo (vocal), Mrs. J. J. Cole; 5. Toast, Women in Indiana, Gen. John Coburn; 6. Toast, Women in the "Revised Version," Arthur W. Tyler; 7. Music, solo (vocal), Arthur Miller: 8. Toast, The Literary Women of Indiana. 9. Toast, Women in the U. S. School System, Horace S. Tarbell; 10. Recitation, Lida Hood Talbott; 11. Toast, Our Forefathers, Rev. Myron W. Reed; 12. A Reply, Mary C. Raridan; 13. Music, solo (vocal), Mrs. J. C. New. Music in charge of Mrs. John C. New. W. B. Stone, accompanist.

formal toasts, the president called upon Gov. Albert G. Porter, who had come in a few minutes before. He thanked the meeting for its reference to what he had done for the cause of equal suffrage, and announced that while he remained governor of Indiana he would do all he could for the rights of women.* He referred to the progress made, and to the refining influence that women would have on political matters. Of all the social entertainments given, none has secured more converts than the celebration of Susan B. Anthony's sixty-second birthday. The arrangements for this event were placed in the hands of Mrs. Mary E. N. Carey and Mrs. May Wright Sewall. The following account, prepared by the author of this chapter for the Indianapolis *Times* of February 18, 1882, will sufficiently indicate the spirit of the occasion:

The anniversary was a unique event. A number of invitations were issued to citizens interested in suffrage who were not formally connected with the association. As a result, on the evening of February 15, there were gathered in the spacious parlors of Dr. Carey's hospitable home, one hundred and fifty persons representing the best circles of Indianapolis society. A portrait of Miss Anthony rested upon an easel, conspicuously placed, that all might see the serene face of the woman who for thirty years has preached the gospel of political freedom, and expounded the constitution of the United States in favor of justice to all. The programme was somewhat informal, all but two of the speeches † being spontaneous expressions of admiration for Miss Anthony and her fidelity to principle. There were two regrets connected with the programme. These were caused by the absence of Gov. Porter and Hon. Schuyler Colfax; but the gracious presence of Mrs. Colfax was a reminder of her husband's fidelity to our cause, and Mrs. Porter's sympathetic face was a scarcely less potent support than would have been a speech from the governor. Just before the close of the meeting the following telegram was sent to Miss Anthony:

Susan B. Anthony, Tenafly, New Jersey.

The Indianapolis Equal Suffrage Society, in meeting assembled with many friends sends you greeting on this anniversary occasion, in recognition of your devotion to the cause of women. MAY WRIGHT SEWALL, *Secretary.*

To report the details of this social gathering would be wearisome, but some reflections to which the occasion gave rise may be permitted. One lady upon seeing the invitation to the meeting exclaimed: "This little bit of paper is an indication of a higher civilization than I supposed we had yet entered upon. Until recently it has been like the betrayal of a secret for a woman, particularly for an unmarried woman, to have a birthday." This exclamation but expresses a historical fact and a prophetic truth. So long as woman's only value depended upon physical charms, the years which destroyed them were deemed enemies. The fact that an unmarried woman's sixty-second birthday can be celebrated, shows the dawning of the idea that the loss of youth and its fresh beauty may be more than compensated by the higher charms of intellectual attainments. The time will never come when women, or men either, will delight in the possession of crows-feet, gray hairs and wrinkles; but the time will come, aye, and now is, when they will view these blemishes as but a petty price to pay for the joy of new knowledge, for the deeper joy of closer contact with humanity, and for the deepest joy of worthy work well done.

The first legislative hearing since 1860, was that granted January, 1871, to Miss Amanda Way and Mrs. Emma B. Swank. The two houses received them in joint session, the lieutenant-governor and speaker of the

* The speakers were Helen M. Gouger, Florence M. Adkinson, Mary A. Haggart, Ex-Gov. Baker, Judge Martindale, Mrs. Wallace, Messrs. Walker and Dooley, editors of the *Times* and *Herald*, Mr. Tarbell, superintendent of the city schools, and May Wright Sewall.

† See Indiana Appendix, note A.

house occupying the speaker's desk. Mr. William Cumback introduced Miss Way, who read the following memorial:

Mr. President and Gentlemen—We come before you as a committee appointed by the Woman Suffrage Association to memorialize your honorable body in behalf of the women of Indiana. We ask you to take the necessary steps to so amend the State constitution as to secure to women the right of suffrage. We believe the extension of the full rights of citizenship to all the people of the State, is in accordance with the fundamental principles of a just government. We believe that as woman has an equal interest with man in all public questions, she should therefore have an equal voice in their decision. We believe that as woman's life, prosperity and happiness are equally dependent upon the order and morality of society, she should have an equal voice in the laws regulating her surroundings. We believe that as woman is human, she has human needs and rights, and as she is held responsible to law, she should have an equal voice in electing her law-makers.

We believe that the interests of man and woman are equally improved in securing to both equal education, a place in the trades and professions, equal honor and dignity everywhere; and as the first step to this end is equality before the law, we, your petitioners, ask that you extend to the women of Indiana the right of suffrage, and thus enable one-half the citizens of the State to protect themselves in their most sacred rights.

Miss Way spoke briefly to the points in the memorial, urging the legislators to give to women the same chances for improvement, the same means for defense, and the same weapons for protection that they have secured to themselves. Mrs. Swank also made a logical and eloquent speech. No action was taken by the legislature.

On January 22, 1875, the two houses of the General Assembly convened in joint session, to receive petitions from the "Temperance Women of Indiana," who were on this occasion represented by Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace, Mrs. Avaline and Mrs. Robinson, who had been appointed by the State Temperance Association. Mrs. Wallace read a memorial and stated that it was signed by 10,000 women, and then argued its various points and pleaded for the action of the "Honorable Body." Mrs. Avaline and Mrs. Robinson followed in briefer, but not less earnest appeals. The only answer elicited by these ladies was the assurance made by Dr. Thompson, a member of the Senate, that he and his colleagues were there, "not to represent their *consciences*, but to represent their *constituents*," whose will was directly opposed to the petition offered.

On January 3, 1877, a resolution to the effect that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States give the ballot to women, came to its third reading in the lower House. On that occasion, Mrs. Wallace and Dr. Mary F. Thomas represented the women of Indiana, and Mrs. Mary A. Livermore was present to lend the assistance of her oratory. The speeches created a profound impression, but neither native nor foreign eloquence was able to secure the requisite vote. When the ayes and nays were called, the resolution was lost—51 to 22.

On February 24, 1879, once again in joint session, the General Assembly received a committee appointed by the State Association and the Equal Suffrage Society of Indianapolis, to support woman's claim to the ballot. Mrs. Wallace, Dr. Mary F. Thomas, Mary E. Haggart and Amy E. Dunn, each spoke at length on the points clearly set forth in the memorial. Whatever arguments could reach the intellect, whatever could touch the

Digitized

sensibilities, were urged by these ladies on that occasion, and the gentlemen did not fail to compliment their abilities, although the exercise of them had no palpable effect upon legislation.

Before the General Assembly of 1880–81, had convened, it was known by its members-elect that the women of the State would be a constant factor in their deliberations. They had been notified of this intention by the circular letter from the City Society, and by the published fact that the State Association had already appointed representatives, whose duty it should be to secure a hearing for such an amendment to the constitution of the State as should enable women to vote. As soon as the legislature assembled, committees on women's claims were appointed in both branches; Simeon P. Yancey being the chairman of the Senate, and J. M. Furnas of the House, committee. Two points had been determined upon. These were to try to secure the passage of a bill which should immediately authorize women to vote for presidential electors, and such an amendment to the constitution of the State as should enable women to exercise the right of suffrage on all questions.

In connection with the first of these points the name of Helen M. Gougar deserves especial mention. At the Washington convention of the American Association, Mr. Blackwell suggested that the States try to secure the electoral ballot for women, and as soon as Mrs. Gougar returned she urged the members of the legislature to take the matter up. At her suggestion, Dr. Mary F. Thomas addressed a letter to W. D. Wallace, esq., a prominent lawyer of Lafayette, asking him if, in his opinion, the extension of the electoral ballot to women would be incompatible with the present constitution of the State; in reply to this Mr. Wallace set forth an exhaustive argument,* proving the entire constitutionality of such an act. Five thousand were printed and gratuitously distributed throughout the State.

The Committee on Women's Claims in both Houses met at sundry times with members of the Suffrage Association to discuss the merits of these bills and to become familiar with the arguments. During the regular session Mrs. Wallace and Mrs. Gougar spent two consecutive weeks in attendance at the legislature, watching the attitude of the different members and lobbying, in the good sense of that word. The immediate object was to secure the passage of the electoral bill, for that once gained, and women by act of the legislature made voters upon the most important question, it was reasonably thought that the passage of the amendment would be thereby facilitated. A hearing was granted on February 16, 1881, and the House took a recess to listen to the speeches of the women appointed by the State Association, Mrs. Haggart and Mrs. Gougar. The next day, February 17, the Senate afforded a similar opportunity, and the same ladies addressed that body.

In addition to the faithful exertions of Mrs. Wallace and Mrs. Gougar, and the public hearing granted by both houses, much quiet but most effective work was done with individual members. To no one is more due than to Paulina T. Merritt, whose reputation for intelligent charity is

* See Appendix to Indiana, note B.

widely known. Mrs. Merritt was a frequent attendant upon the sessions of the legislature and her untiring efforts in private conversations with members were invaluable. In spite of all these influences, when the electoral bill was brought to a vote upon its third reading, it was lost on the ground that it was unconstitutional.

At the special session all efforts centered upon the bill for amending section 2, of article II., of the State constitution, so as to give women the right to vote in all elections. Mrs. Wallace and Mrs. Gougar gave another week to the work, and on April 7 the bill was brought to a vote in the House, and passed—ayes 62, nays 24; in the Senate, on April 8, it also passed—ayes 25, nays 18; and so the first entrenchment was won.

No one believed that the bill to amend the constitution would have passed had it not been preceded by the battle over the electoral bill and the consequent education of the General Assembly in regard to this great question of political rights. Immediately a conference was held as to the proper manner of expressing our gratitude to the committees on women's political claims. It was at first thought the recognition should come from the Equal Suffrage Society, but it was finally considered wiser to have a reception given the honorable body by a voluntary committee of women who should act quite independently of any society.*

The passage of the amendment by the legislature of 1881 gave the advocates of our cause a common objective point, and the efforts of all during the two years immediately succeeding were directed toward securing the election of such a legislature as might be relied upon to repass the bill in 1883. The State society at its annual meeting enlarged its central committee and instructed it to arrange meetings in various parts of the State, to send out speakers, and to organize local societies.† This committee prepared a letter, for general distribution, indicating to the women of the State their duty in the premises, and suggesting various lines of work. Blanks for a special petition to the General Assembly were sent to every township, which were industriously circulated and numerously signed.

In the spring of 1882 the officers of the State society issued a call for a mass-meeting, to which "all women within the boundaries of the State who believed in equal suffrage, or were interested in the fate of the pending amendment," were invited. The meeting was held on May 19, at the

* The following invitation was sent to every member of the legislature who had voted for the amendment, and also to all the leading people of the city: The pleasure of your company is requested at the parlors of the New-Denison, Friday evening, April 15, from 8 to 12, where a social entertainment will be given in honor of the passage of the suffrage amendment by our State legislature. [Signed:] Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace, Miss Catherine Merrill, Mrs. Harvey G. Carey, Mrs. Charles Kregelo, Mrs. Henry D. Pierce, Mrs. Thomas A. Hendricks, May Wright Sewall, Mrs. George Merritt, Mrs. John C. New and Mrs. John M. Judah. The programme was as follows: 1. Music, Solo (vocal), Zelda Seguin Wallace. 2. Toast, Our Legislature, Senator Spann. 3. Toast, Our Opponents, Colonel DeWitt Wallace. 4. Toast, The Press and Progress, Laura Ream. 5. Toast, The Indiana Woman under the Law, William Wallace. 6. Music, Solo (vocal), Mrs. John C. New. 7. Toast, The Ideal Man, Mrs. J. M. Judah. 8. Toast, The Ideal Woman, Mr. A. S. Caldwell. 9. Toast, The Home of the Future, May Wright Sewall. 10. Music, German Song, Professor John Fiske. 11. Toast, The Woman who "Don't want to Vote," Gertrude Garrison. 12. Recitation, Lida Hood Talbot. 13. Toast, The Attitude of the Pulpit toward Reform, Rev. Myron W. Reed. 14. Music, Solo (vocal), Zelda Seguin Wallace.

† The persons thus authorized by the central committee to hold meetings and organize societies were Dr. Mary F. Thomas, Mary E. Haggart, Zerelda G. Wallace, Helen M. Gougar, May Wright Sewall and L. May Wheeler.

Digitized by Google

Grand Opera House, and the attendance exceeded the most extravagant hopes of those who had called it. If any came to scoff, they remained to participate with pride in this remarkable convention, which is yet frequently referred to as the largest and most impressive meeting ever held in the Hoosier capital. The call had invited those who could not attend the meeting to manifest their sympathy by sending postal-cards to the corresponding secretary. These were received in such numbers for several days that Mrs. Adkinson and the half-dozen clerks appointed to assist her in counting them, unable to bring in a full report, announced at the close of the evening session, that having reached 5,000, they desisted from further enumeration.

No effort was spared to make the demonstration truly representative of the suffrage interest throughout the State. All the sessions were presided over by Mrs. Sewall, who called the roll by congressional districts, some one of whose representatives responded. The ease and dignity with which women, many of whom had never spoken before any audience save their own neighbors gathered in Sunday-school or prayer-meeting, reported the status of their respective communities on the suffrage question, was matter of astonishment as well as of admiration.* So exceptional in all regards was the conduct of the meeting that the papers united in expressing surprise at the strength of the suffrage sentiment in the State as indicated by the mass-convention.

This meeting of May 19, 1882, struck the key on which the friends in the State spoke during the summer and fall of that year. Large numbers of societies were organized and numerous meetings held, the immediate object being to secure the election of a legislature that should vote to submit the amendment passed by the General Assembly of 1881 to the decision of what is mis-named "a popular vote." The degree to which this action influenced the politicians of the State cannot be accurately known, but we are compelled to believe that it was one of the causes which induced the Republicans in convention assembled to declare for the "submission of the pending amendments." The Republican State convention was held August 8, 1882, and the first plank in the platform reads thus:

Resolved, First—That reposing trust in the people as the fountain of power, we demand that the pending amendments to the constitution shall be agreed to and submitted by the next legislature to the voters of the State for their decision thereon. These amendments were not partisan in their origin, and are not so in character, and should not be made so in voting upon them. Recognizing the fact that the people are divided in sentiment in regard to the propriety of their adoption or rejection, and cherishing the right of private judgment, we favor the submission of these amendments at a special election, so that there may be an intelligent decision thereon, uninfluenced by partisan issues.

At the mass-meeting of May 19, Mrs. P. T. Merritt of Indianapolis, Mrs. M. E. M. Price of Kokomo, and Mrs. J. C. Ridpath of Greencastle were

* Besides these five-minute reports, addresses were delivered by Rev. Myron W. Reed, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Indianapolis; Captain DeWitt Wallace of Lafayette, Dr. Ridpath of DePaun University, Colonel Maynard, chief editorial writer on the *Sentinel*; Mrs. Haggart, Mrs. Gougar, Mrs. Josephine R. Nichols, and other men and women of less prominence, but on that occasion of hardly less interest.

appointed as delegates to the different political State conventions. As a Republican, Mrs. Merritt was received with great courtesy and accorded time to speak. Her address was characterized by sound logic and dignity of expression, and was reported in full with the rest of the proceedings of the Republican convention. As a prohibition amendment had also been passed by the legislature of 1881, the interests of suffrage and prohibition in the campaign of 1882 were identical. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Indiana sent Mrs. Helen M. Gougar to the Republican State convention, by which she was respectfully received and which she ably addressed.

The advocates of suffrage did not content themselves during the summer of 1882 by merely holding suffrage meetings proper, and addressing political bodies, but they sought every opportunity to reach the ears of the people for whatever purpose convened. The Equal Suffrage Society received from the managers of the Acton camp-meeting a place on their programme; accordingly Mrs. Haggart and Mrs. Gougar, as delegates, addressed immense audiences. Both of these ladies labored indefatigably, discussing the question of submission of the amendments before Sunday-school conventions, teachers' associations, agricultural fairs, picnics and assemblies of every name. Others rendered less conspicuous, but not less earnest or constant service; and when the political campaign proper opened, it was evident that every candidate would firmly and unreservedly answer the challenge: "Submission, or non-submission?"

For the first time in the history of Indiana, women were employed by party managers to address political meetings and advocate the election of candidates. Mrs. Gougar addressed Republican rallies at various points; she and Mrs. Haggart together made a canvass of Tippecanoe county on behalf of the Republican candidate for representative in the General Assembly, Captain W. De Witt Wallace, who was committed not only to the submission of the amendments, but also to the advocacy of both woman suffrage and prohibition. The animosity of the liquor league was aroused, and this powerful association threw itself against submission. The result was the election of a legislature containing so large a Democratic majority that there was no ground for hoping that the amendments would be re-passed and sent to the voters of the State for final adoption or rejection.

Though the submission of the amendments was one of the chief issues in the campaign, many candidates who pledged themselves on the ground that they involved questions which it was the privilege of the voters to decide, reserved their own opinions upon their merits. There were, however, candidates who openly espoused woman suffrage *per se*.* Knowing that a majority of the members of the General Assembly were pledged to vote down the pending amendments, the friends tacitly agreed to maintain a dignified silence toward that body concerning them. The Suffrage Society at the capital, however, appointed a committee † to watch the in-

* Among these the names of William Dudley Foulke of Richmond, W. DeWitt Wallace of Lafayette, G. H. Thomas of Huntington, and S. P. Yancey, merit honorable mention.

† Mrs. Sewall, Mrs. Merritt and Mrs. Mary E. Newman Carey.

Digitized by Google

terests of woman in the legislature; and through its influence, special committees on women's claims were obtained in both Houses. Disappointed by the result in the legislature of 1883, but not discouraged, the society continued to labor with undiminished zeal, and sought every legitimate opportunity to prove woman a factor in State politics.

Several weeks prior to the Republican nominating convention at Chicago, June 3, 1884, this society appointed committees to correspond with each of the gentlemen prominently named as candidates for nomination to the office of president, and also appointed committees* to press upon the attention of the different parties the political claims of women. The society instructed each committee to carry on its work according to the united judgment of its members and continue it until the close of the legislative session of 1885. The committee appointed to communicate with the Republicans addressed a letter to each of the thirty delegates sent by Indiana to the nominating convention at Chicago. They also addressed letters to the Republican State central committee, and through the courtesy of Mr. John Overmeyer, chairman, they were given an opportunity to appear before the committee on resolutions. Mrs. Sewall presented a resolution, and in a brief speech urged its adoption and incorporation into the platform of the Republican party. Mrs. Merritt and Mrs. Sewall were offered an opportunity to speak before the convention, which they declined in the belief that it was a greater gain to the cause to appear before the resolution and platform committee than before the convention itself.

To what an appalling degree women were discriminated against by the law prior to 1860, may be inferred from subsequent legislative enactments. At almost every sitting of the biënnial legislature, since 1860, some important change will be observed. In 1861 was passed the following:

AN ACT *to enlarge the Legal Capacity of Married Women whose Husbands are Insane, and to enable them to Contract as if they were Unmarried.*

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana: That all married women, or those who may hereafter be married, whose husbands are or may be insane, are, during the continuance of such insanity, hereby enabled and authorized to make and to execute all such contracts, and to be contracted with in relation to their separate property, as they could if they were unmarried, and they may sue and be sued as if they were *sole*.

The legislature of 1863 was undisturbed by any question concerning women. In 1865 the legislature discriminated against women by the passage of a very long act, prescribing the manner in which enumerations of *white male citizens* shall be made; thus implying that a *white male citizen* is an honorable and important person, whose existence is to be noted with due care; with a care that distinguishes him equally above the *white female* and the *black male* citizen, and in effect places these two unenumerated divisions of human beings into one class.

Another act of 1865 reäffirmed an act of 1852 which prescribed the classes of persons capable of making a will, from which married women were excluded.

---

* Republican, May Wright Sewall and Paulina T. Merritt; Democratic, Mary E. Haggart and Florence M. Adkinson.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

May Wright Sewall

Digitized by Google

[illegible]

[illegible] in case it was worth [illegible]

[illegible] property was less than $[illegible]

[illegible] with other [illegible]

[illegible] possible ability of [illegible]

[illegible] the passage of the following [illegible]

[illegible] enacted by the General Assembly [illegible]

[illegible] Assembly of the State [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] shall not [illegible] women [illegible]

[illegible] from [illegible]

The legislature of 1873 also passed an act [illegible] it is formally provided that a wife [illegible] the suit and to control the sum [illegible]

[illegible] an act passed the General Assembly [illegible] property in which a woman has, by virtue [illegible] right, for less than four-ninths of its appr[illegible] that on the sale of any piece or aggregate of [illegible] exceeding $[illegible], the wife has her absolute right [illegible] that in case of a judicial sale, the wife [illegible] absolute, and she may demand a partition.

[illegible] the General Assembly passed an act enabl[illegible] husbands are insane to sell and to convey real-e[illegible] married women, in the same way as if *femes sole*.

When the act for establishing a female prison passed [illegible] it provided that the board managing its affairs [illegible] who should be assisted by an advisory board [illegible] the two women. By the legislature of 1[illegible] to make the managing board consist of [illegible] the advisory board was abolished.*

[illegible] the changes effected in the statutory law of Indiana since 1860, the following is the most important and may be regarded, so far as women

* [illegible] this prison see Appendix [illegible] Indiana chapter, note [illegible]

Digitized by Google

Mary Wright Sewall

Digitized by Google

The legislature of 1867 passed an act in regard to conveyance of lands by wives of persons of unsound mind, which read as follows:

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Indiana: That in cases where the guardian of any person of unsound mind, under the direction of any court of competent jurisdiction has made, or may hereafter make, sale of any lands of such person of unsound mind, the wife of such person of unsound mind may by her separate deed release and convey all her interest in and title to such land, and her deed so made shall thereafter debar her from all claim to such land, and shall have the same effect on her rights as if her husband had been of sound mind and she had joined with such husband in the execution of such conveyance.

In 1869, an act passed by the legislature of 1852, providing for the settlement of a decedent's estate, was so amended as to provide that the widow might select articles to the value of $500, or receive the first $500 derived from the sale, or in case it was worth no more than $500, might hold it. In 1871 the amendment of 1869 was further amended so that in case the personal property was less than $500 the deficit could be a lien on the real estate, to be settled with other judgments and mortgages.

In 1873 the possible ability of women to serve the State officially was recognized by the passage of the following bill:

SECTION 1. Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Indiana: That women are hereby declared to be eligible to any office, the election to which is or shall be vested in the General Assembly of this State; or the appointment to which is or shall be vested in the governor thereof.

SEC. 2. The foregoing shall not include women who shall labor under any disability which may prevent them from binding themselves by an official bond.

The legislature of 1873 also passed an act regulating the liquor traffic, in which it is formally provided that a wife shall have the same right to sue, to control the suit, and to control the sum recovered by the suit, as a *feme sole.*

In 1875 an act passed the General Assembly making it impossible to sell real property in which a woman has, by virtue of her marriage, an inchoate right, for less than four-ninths of its appraised value: and also providing that upon the sale of any piece or aggregate of pieces of real property not exceeding $2,000, the wife has her absolute right; and moreover providing that in case of a judicial sale, the wife's inchoate interests become absolute, and she may demand a partition.

In 1877 the General Assembly passed an act enabling married women whose husbands are insane to sell and to convey real-estate belonging to such married women, in the same way as if *femes soles.*

When the act for establishing a female prison passed the legislature of 1860, it provided that the board managing its affairs should consist of three men, who should be assisted by an advisory board composed of one man and two women. By the legislature of 1877 this section was so amended as to make the managing board consist of women exclusively, and the advisory board was abolished.*

Of all the changes effected in the statutory law of Indiana since 1860, the following is the most important and may be regarded, so far as women

* For an account of this prison, see Appendix to Indiana chapter, note C.

Digitized by Google

are concerned, the measure of the highest legislative justice thus far attained in any State. This bill was prepared by Addison C. Harris, then representing Indianapolis in the State Senate, and was approved March 25, 1879:

AN ACT *concerning Married Women—Approved March 25, 1879:*

SEC. 1.—Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana: A married woman may bargain, sell, assign and transfer her separate personal property the same as if she were *sole.*

SEC. 2.—A married woman may carry on any trade or business, and perform any labor or service on her sole and separate account. The earnings and profits of any married woman accruing from her trade, business, services or labor, other than labor for her husband or family, shall be her sole and separate property.

SEC. 3.—A married woman may enter into any contract in reference to her personal estate, trade, business, labor or service, and the management and improvement of her separate real property, the same as if she were *sole;* and her separate estate, real and personal, shall be liable therefor on execution or other judicial process.

SEC. 4.—No conveyance or contract made by a married woman for the sale of her lands or any interest therein, other than leases for a term not exceeding three years, and mortgages on lands to secure the purchase money of such lands, shall be valid, unless her husband shall join therein. Provided, however, that if she shall have attempted to convey her real estate or shall have agreed to convey the same, and shall have received the whole or any part of the consideration therefor, the person paying such consideration, or the person for whose benefit the same was paid, shall have the right to sue and recover judgment therefor, and the same may be enforced against the property of such married woman.

SEC. 5.—A married woman shall be bound by the covenants of the title in a deed of conveyance of her real property.

SEC. 6.—A married woman may bring and maintain an action in her own name against any person or body corporate for damages for any injury to her person or character, the same as if she were *sole;* and the money recovered shall be her separate property, and her husband in such case shall not be liable for costs.

SEC. 7.—Whenever the husband causes repairs or improvements to be made on the real property of the wife, with her knowledge and consent thereto in writing, delivered to the contractor or person performing the labor or furnishing the material, she shall alone be liable for material furnished or labor done.

SEC. 8.—A husband shall not be liable for any debts contracted by the wife in carrying on any trade, labor or business on her sole and separate account, nor for improvements made by her authority on her separate real property.

SEC. 9.—Whenever a judgment is recovered against a married woman, her separate property may be sold on execution to satisfy the same, as in other cases. Provided, however, that her wearing apparel and articles of personal adornment purchased by her, not exceeding two hundred dollars in value, and all such jewelry, ornaments, books, works of art and *virtu*, and other such effects for personal or household use as may have been given to her as presents, gifts and keep-sakes, shall not be subject to execution. And provided further, that she shall hold as exempt, except for the purchase money therefor, other property to the amount of three hundred dollars to be set apart and appraised in the manner provided by law for exemption of property.

SEC. 10.—A married woman shall not mortgage or in any manner encumber her separate property acquired by descent, devise or gift, as a security for the debt or liability of her husband or any other person.

The legislature of 1881 enacted the following, which is really a sequence of the property-rights statute of 1879:

A married woman may sue alone when: *First*—The action concerns her own property. *Second*—When the action is between herself and her husband. But in no case

shall she be required to sue or defend by guardian or next friend, unless she be under twenty-one years.

It further enacted, making it section 28, to act 38, that: When a husband or father has deserted his family, or is imprisoned, the wife or mother may prosecute or defend in his name any action which he might have prosecuted or defended, and shall have the same powers and rights therein as he might have had.

The legislature of 1881 also passed the following:

AN ACT *to Authorize the Election of Women to School Offices:*

SEC. 1.—Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Indiana, that any woman, married or single, of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, and possessing the qualifications prescribed for men, shall be eligible to any office under the general or special school laws of the State.

SEC. 2.—That any woman elected or appointed to any office under the provisions of this act, before she enters upon the discharge of the duties of her office, shall qualify and give bond as required by law; and such bond shall be binding upon her and her securities.

The following, enacted by this same legislature of 1881, would indicate that fidelity to his domestic obligations is not even yet esteemed in man as a virtue of high order; the value attached to the fidelity can be measured by the penalty incurred by infidelity, which is thus stated:

Whoever without cause deserts his wife or children, and leaves wife and child or children as a charge upon any county of this State, shall be fined not more than $100 nor less than $10.

As has been indicated in another connection, it was the legislature of 1881 which distinguished itself by passing a bill for amending section 2 of article II. of the State constitution so as to give women the right to vote in all elections. The legislature of 1883 did nothing to further ameliorate the legal condition of women; and the highest legal rights enjoyed by women of Indiana are indicated in the foregoing recital of legislative action upon the subject from 1860 to 1884 inclusive.

For some years after public schools were established in Indiana, women had no recognition. I am told by a reliable gentleman, Dr. R. T. Brown, who served from 1833 to 1840 as examiner in one of the most advanced counties of the commonwealth, that during that period no woman ever applied to him for a license to teach, and that up to 1850 very few were employed in the public schools. At that time it was permitted women to teach "subscription" schools during the vacations, for which purpose the use of the district school-house was frequently granted. It was by demonstrating their capacity in this unobtrusive use of holidays, that women obtained employment in the regular schools. The tables show that in 1861 there were 6,421 men and 1,905 women employed in the primary schools, and 128 men and 72 women in the high schools. From that time up to 1866, owing to the war, the number of men decreased while that of women rapidly increased. The tables for that year show 5,330 men and 4,163 women in the schools. The number of men employed in 1880 was 7,802, of women, 5,776. While the very best places are held by men, the majority of the second-rate places are filled by women, and men fill a majority of the lowest places. The average daily wages received by men engaged in the public schools in 1880 was $1.86, while the average daily wages of women was $1.76.

Digitized by Google

Of the twenty-six academies, colleges and universities, all are, with two notable exceptions—Hanover and Wabash—open to women. Of these, Butler, at Irvington, formerly known as the Northwestern Christian University, was the first to admit women to a "female course," which its managers arranged to meet the needs of the female mind. In its laudable endeavor to adapt its requirements to this intermediate class of beings, the university substituted music for mathematics, and French for Greek. Few, however, availed themselves of this course, and it was utterly rejected by Demia Butler, a daughter of the founder of the institution, who entered it in 1860, and graduated from what was then known as the male course, in 1864, thus winning the right to be remembered as the first woman in Indiana to demonstrate the capacity of her sex to cope with the clsssics and higher mathematics. From that time the "female course" became gradually less popular, until it was discarded. One after another, private and denominational schools have fallen into line, until nearly all of them are open to women without humiliating conditions.

Up to 1867 the Indiana University exhibited the anomaly of a great institution of learning supported by the State, and regarding itself as the crown of the public-school system, free to but one-half of the children of the commonwealth. Since that date it has been open equally to both sexes in all three of its departments—the State Normal School, located at Terre Haute, the Agricultural College, located at Lafayette and commonly known as Purdue University, and the State University proper, including literary and scientific departments located at Bloomington. Of this last branch, 30 per cent. are women. That there is no longer any discrimination in these higher institutions of learning is not true. Girls must always feel that they are regarded as belonging to a subordinate class, wherever women are not found in the faculty and board of managers. The depressing influence of their absence in superior positions cannot be measured.

Very few women are found in college faculties in Indiana, and none on boards of trustees. Those most conspicuous in ability are Mrs. Sarah A. Oren,* who, having served two successive terms as State librarian, was called from that position to fill a chair at Purdue University, where she remained several years; Miss Catharine Merrill, professor of English literature in Butler University, who throughout her term of service from 1869 to 1883 enjoyed the deserved reputation of being one of the strongest members of the faculty;† and Miss Rebecca I. Thompson, who is professor of mathematics at Franklin College, the leading Baptist school in the State. The women occupying these conspicuous positions are all identified with the suffrage movement; Professor Thompson, of Franklin, is the president of the Johnson County Suffrage Association. Miss N. Cropsey has served the cause of public education in Indianapolis in some capacity for twenty years, and has for several years been superintendent of the primary schools, a place which she fills with acknowledged ability. Miss

* See Appendix to Indiana chapter, note G.

† Miss Merrill resigned in the autumn of 1883, and was immediately succeeded by Miss Harriet Noble of Vincennes, a graduate of Vassar, and a lady of most admirable qualities, whose success is assured by the record of her first year in this responsible position.

Cropsey is another living denial of the common assertion, that only half-cultured and ill-paid women want the ballot.

Of the four medical colleges in Indianapolis, two admit women and two exclude them. No theological school in the State receives women, nor does the only law school, which is located at Indianapolis; but its former president, Hon. James B. Black, told me that it was ready to receive them upon application.

Formerly, many questions now decided by the board of trustees of each school district, were directly settled by the people themselves at the annual school meeting. For instance, the teacher for the coming term was elected from among the candidates for that place; the salary to be paid, the length of term, the location of the school-house, were all questions to be decided by ballot. I have reliable authority for the assertion that in some parts of the State, as early as 1860, widows, and wives whose husbands were necessarily absent from the school meetings, voted upon these questions. During the years of the war this practice became very common, but fell into disuse upon the return of peace.

There are many physicians in Indiana enjoying the merited esteem of their respective communities and having a lucrative practice. The most notable example of success in this profession is Dr. Mary F. Thomas of Richmond.* Another living testimony to woman's right in the medical profession is Dr. Rachel Swain of Indianapolis, whose patrons are among the first families of the city. By zealous devotion to her profession she has secured the respect and social recognition of the community in which she moves. As an avowed friend of suffrage, whose word in season is never lacking, Dr. Swain carries a knowledge of our principles into circles where it would otherwise slowly penetrate. Dr. Mary Wilhite of Crawfordsville ranks with the best physicians of that city. In her practice she has gained a competence for herself and disseminated among her patients a knowledge of hygienic laws that has improved the health and the morals of the community to which she has ministered. She, too, advocates political equality for woman. Dr. Sarah Stockton of Lafayette settled in Indianapolis in the autumn of 1883, and was soon, on the petition of leading citizens, including both men and women, appointed as physician to the Woman's Department of the Hospital for the Insane. Her professional labors at the hospital and in general practice indicate both learning and skill. In November, Dr. Marie Haslep was elected attendant physician at the Woman's Reformatory, a State institution having some four hundred inmates, where her services have been characterized by faithfulness and caution.

Elizabeth Eaglesfield, a graduate of the law department of Michigan University, was admitted to the bar of Marion county in the spring of 1885, and is the first woman to open an independent law-office in this State.

Very few women have served in the ministry. The only one who ever secured any prominence in this profession was Miss Prudence LeClerc, who was pastor of the Universalist church in Madison in 1870-71, and

* See sketch of Dr. Thomas, Vol. I., page 324.

Digitized by Google

served parishes at different points in south-eastern Indiana until her death in 1878. Miss LeClerc frequently spoke at suffrage conventions, and called meetings wherever she preached, instructing the people in the philosophy of this reform.

To obtain accurate statistics as to the professions and industries is extremely difficult, as the year 1881 was the first in which the State considered women at all. That year the head of the bureau of statistics sent to each town and county commissioner certain sets of questions relative to women's occupations. The grace with which they were received, the seriousness with which they were considered, the consequent accuracy with which they were answered, may be inferred from the fact that one trustee replied, "The women in our county are mostly engaged in baby-tending," and that his response was generally copied by the press as a manifestation of brilliant wit. Although some commissioners felt their time too valuable to spend in gathering information relative to the work of women, from the reports of those who seriously undertook to canvass this matter, a table has been arranged and published, which, though incomplete, must be regarded, both in variety of occupations and in the numbers of women registered, as a most favorable showing for this Western State. The total number of women engaged outside of home, in non-domestic and money-making industries, is 15,122; the number of industries represented by them is 51. Add to these the number of teachers, and we have over 20,000 women in the trades and professions denied the ballot, that sole weapon pledged by a republic to every citizen for the protection of person and property.

Of the men and women prominent in this movement since 1860, whose names are not mentioned in the first volume, the one meriting the first place is beyond doubt Dr. R. T. Brown of Indianapolis. He has the longest record as an advocate of suffrage to be found in the State. As a speaker in the first Harrison campaign (1836) he advocated suffrage without regard to sex. Engaged as a teacher or inspector in the public schools in the early years, Dr. Brown argued the adaptation of women to the teacher's profession, and insisted that salaries should be independent of sex; and in many individual cases where he had authority, women secured this recognition before it was generally admitted even in theory to be just.

When, in 1855, the Northwestern Christian (now Butler) University was founded, Dr. Brown, as one of the trustees, advocated coëducation; in 1858 he took the chair of natural science, and in that branch taught classes of both sexes until 1871. In 1868 he was active in organizing the Indiana Medical College on the basis of equal rights to women, and filled the chair of chemistry until 1872; in 1873 he was appointed to the chair of physiology, which he held until 1877, and then resigned because the board of trustees determined to exclude women. This proves that Dr. Brown's devotion to the doctrine of equal rights is of that rare degree which will bear the crucial test of official and pecuniary sacrifice. He has been an active member of the State and city suffrage associations from the beginning.

The name of Mary E. Haggart first appears as a member of the State Association at the convention held in Indianapolis in 1869. In 1870, Mr. Hadley made a speech in the State Senate against woman suffrage, to which Mrs. Haggart wrote an able reply which was published and widely commented on by the press of the State. Her next notable effort was in a discussion through several numbers of the *Ladies' Own Magazine*, published by Mrs. Cora Bland, where she completely refuted the objections urged by her opponent, a literary gentleman of some note. Mrs. Haggart has addressed the legislatures of her own State, of Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Kentucky, as well as the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives at the hearing granted the National Association. She seldom speaks without the most careful preparation, and never without manifesting abilities of the highest order. Perhaps no woman in the State, as a speaker, has won higher encomiums from the press or has better deserved them.

The first active step taken in suffrage by Mrs. Florence M. Adkinson (then Miss Burlingame) was to call a convention in Lawrenceburg. In 1871, 1872, she gave several lectures on suffrage and temperance in Ohio, and held a series of meetings in southeastern Indiana. Though an acceptable speaker, it is as a writer that Mrs. Adkinson is best known; she is an officer in both the State and the city organizations, and in every capacity serves the cause with rare fidelity.

The name of Lizzie Boynton of Crawfordsville frequently occurs in suffrage reports between 1865 and 1870. She was a member of the State Association and a frequent speaker at its conventions. Besides working in that body, she assisted in the organization of the local society at Crawfordsville, wrote poems, stories, essays, and won high rank in the State in literature and reform. From mature womanhood her record as Mrs. Harbert belongs to Illinois rather than Indiana.

The first time I met Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace she was circulating a temperance petition to present to the legislature. One day while busy on the third floor of the high-school building a fellow-teacher sent up word that a lady wished to see me. Descending, I was introduced to Mrs. Wallace, who, in a bland way, requested me to sign the paper which she extended. Never doubting that I might do so, I had taken my pen when my eye caught the words: "While we do not clamor for any additional civil or political rights." "But I do clamor," I exclaimed, and threw down the paper and pen and went back to my work, vexed in soul that I should have been dragged down three flights of stairs to see one more proof of the degree to which honorable women love to humiliate themselves before men for sweet favor's sake. Mrs. Wallace went forward with her work of solicitation, thinking me, no doubt, to be a very impetuous, if not impertinent, young woman.

When, however, upon the presentation of her petition, whose framers had taken such care to disclaim any desire "for additional civil and political rights," Mrs. Wallace was startled by Dr. Thompson's avowal (having known the doctor, as she naïvely says, "as a Christian gentleman"), that he was not there "to represent his conscience, but to obey his constitu-

Digitized by Google

ents," in her aroused soul there was that instant born the determination to become a "constituent." As soon as the hearing was at an end, Mrs. Wallace confessed this determination to Dr. Thompson, thanking him for unintentionally awakening her to a sense of woman's proper position in the republic. This change in Mrs. Wallace's attitude was not generally known until the following May, when the annual State Temperance convention was held in Indianapolis; then, in her address before that body, she avowed her conviction that it was woman's duty to seek the ballot as a means of exerting her will upon legislation. From that time Mrs. Wallace has neglected no opportunity to propagate suffrage doctrines, and has been most potent in influencing her temperance coädjutors to embrace these principles. Earnestness and logic are Mrs. Wallace's abiding forces. Her literary work is chiefly confined to correspondence, in which she is so faithful that it is doubtful if any man in public life in Indiana can plead ignorance of the arguments in favor of suffrage. Mrs. Wallace has been an officer in the National, the American and the State suffrage societies, and has served the Equal Suffrage Society of Indianapolis as president most of the time since its formation. Having lived in this city more than half a century, related to many men who have held high official positions, she has had an opportunity to exert a wide influence, and it may be safe to say that, by virtue of her own consecrated life, she exerts more moral power in this community than any other woman in Indiana.

Mrs. Helen M. Gougar has addressed the legislatures of New York, Kansas and Wisconsin, besides that of her own State. As an extempore speaker she has no peer among her co-workers; her first suffrage speech was made at Delphi, May, 1877. In July, 1881, Mrs. Gougar became the editor of *Our Herald*, a weekly which she conducted with great ability and success in the interest of the two constitutional amendments then pending. In 1884, in an extensive lecturing tour, she addressed large audiences in Washington, Philadelphia, New York and Albany. In the year 1883, Mrs. Josephine R. Nichols of Illinois, and Mrs. L. May Wheeler of Massachusetts, came to reside in Indianapolis. Both these ladies have lectured frequently and with marked effect in various parts of the State.

I cannot close without a mention of those public men who have honored this State by their adherence to the principle of woman suffrage and thereby earned a title to the fame which will belong to the advocates of this cause in the hour of its triumph. Among these Hon. George W. Julian is most conspicuous. Referring to his services in congress, Mr. Julian once wrote:

My opinions about woman suffrage, however, date much further back. The subject was first brought to my attention in a brief chapter on the "Political Non-existence of Women," in Miss Martineau's book on "Society in America," which I read in 1847. She there pithily stated the substance of all that has since been said respecting the logic of woman's right to the ballot; and finding myself unable to answer, I accepted it. On recently referring to this chapter I find myself more impressed by its force than when I first read it. * * * My interest in anti-slavery was awakened about the same time, and I regarded it as the *previous* question, and as less abstract and far more important and absorbing than that of suffrage for women. For

the sake of the negro I accepted Mr. Lincoln's philosophy of "one war at a time," though always ready to own and defend my position as to woman's right to the ballot.

The sincerity of Mr. Julian's belief in woman suffrage is proved by his repeated efforts to further the cause in the United States congress. On December 8, 1868, he submitted an amendment to the constitution, guaranteeing suffrage to all United States citizens, which, as the negro had not then been enfranchised, he numbered article fifteen. On March 15, 1869, he submitted the same amendment, with the exception that the words "race" and "color" were omitted; on the same day Mr. Julian offered a bill providing for the immediate enfranchisement of women in all the territories of the United States, thus doubling on one day his claim to the gratitude of American women. On April 4, 1870, he offered another amendment, numbered article sixteen, which followed the exact form and phraseology of the fifteenth. On January 20, 1871, he offered an amendment to the bill, providing a government for the District of Columbia, striking out the word "male" in the section defining the right of suffrage. It is interesting to note that even so long ago that amendment received 55 yeas against 117 nays.* The bills which Mr. Julian thus submitted to congress when he was a member of that body prove his constancy to a cause early espoused, his conversion to which was due to that remarkable English woman whose claims to the gratitude of her American sisters are thus enhanced. Mr. Julian has not worked much with the suffrage societies of his own State, but he has never failed in his repeated canvasses to utter the seasonable word. His conviction that it is the duty of the national government to take the initiative in defining the political rights of its citizens has naturally led him to present this question to the nation as represented in its congress, rather than to agitate it in the State.

Oliver P. Morton and Joseph E. McDonald are two other names conspicuous in Indiana history which occur frequently in connection with "aye" in the records which have preserved the action of every member of congress on the various amendments brought before it involving woman's political equality.

Albert G. Porter, ex-governor of Indiana, has on more than one public occasion avowed his belief in woman's equality as a citizen, and has assented to the proposition that under a republic the only sign of such equality is the ballot. Ardent advocates have often thought him inexcusably reticent in expressing his convictions upon this subject, but such have learned that it is given to but few mortals to "remember those in bonds as bound with them," and no other governor of Indiana has ever taken occasion to remind the General Assembly of its duties to women, as Governor Porter habitually did. In his address of 1881 he called the attention of the legislature to the improved condition of women under the laws, pointed out disabilities still continuing, and bespoke the respectful attention of the General Assembly to the women who proposed to come before it with their claims. In his biënnial message, 1883, the governor recommended the enactment of a statute which should require that

* For these bills and amendments, see Vol. II., pages 325, 333.

at least one of the physicians appointed to attend in the department for women in the hospital for the insane should be a woman. The whole tone of Governor Porter's administration was liberal toward women; he invariably implied his belief in their equality, and on one or two occasions has evinced his respect for their ability by conferring on them responsible offices. Many of the leading men in the Republican party, and a few in the Democratic, are favorable, and while they do not labor for the enfranchisement of their sisters with the same enthusiasm which personal bondage excites, their constant influence is on the side of woman's emancipation.

As to the charities conducted by Indiana women, for a condensed narrative of the efficient service of Mrs. L. B. Wishard and Miss Susan Fussell, I must refer readers to the account kindly prepared for me by Mrs. Paulina T. Merritt.*

Whether or not justified by the facts, the feeling is current that those whom the masses favor hold themselves aloof from those whom personal experience, or a sense of justice, compels to walk the stony path of reform. The *litteratéurs* often form a sort of pseudo-intellectual aristocracy, and do not willingly affiliate with reformers, whom they are ready to assume to be less cultivated than themselves. Of this weakness our literary women have not been guilty. Most of them are members of the suffrage society.†

A system is now developing which will not only stimulate women to engage in competitive industries and secure justice in rewarding such labor, but will greatly facilitate the work of ascertaining what part women do take in the general industries of the State. Indiana, being mainly agricultural, is divided into sixteen districts, each of which has organized an agricultural society. Besides these there are also county societies. These organizations are composed of men and women, the latter having nominally the same powers and privileges as the former. Annually the State Agricultural Association holds a meeting at Indianapolis. This is a delegate body, consisting of representatives from the district and county societies. There is no constitutional check against sending women as delegates, though it has not hitherto been done. One chief duty of the primary convention is to elect a State board of agriculture. This board consists of sixteen members, one for each agricultural district. The managers of the Woman's State Fair Association have called an industrial convention, whose sessions will be held at the same time that the Agricultural Association holds its annual meeting.‡

If the press reflects the public, it also moulds it; and its conservative

---

* See Appendix, Indiana chapter, notes E and F.

† Mrs. Sarah T. Bolton, Laura Ream, Mrs. Lew Wallace, Mary H. Korut, Mary Dean, Margaret Holmes (Mrs. M. V. Bates), Mrs. M. E. Banta, Mrs. Louise V. Boyd, Mrs. Helen V. Austin, Mrs. Hettie A. Morrison, Mrs. E. S. L. Thompson, Mrs. Amy E. Dunn, Mrs. A. D Hawkins, Miss Rena L. Miner, Miss Edna C. Jackson and Mrs. D. M. Jordan are all literary women who sympathize with and aid this reform.

‡ The woman's department has constantly grown in extent and value, until it has become one of the most important features of the State fair, and this year, 1885, the managers have allowed to it twice the space hitherto occupied. It is worthy of note that suffrage papers, tracts and books are always to be found among the exhibits.

attitude is doubtless to a very considerable degree responsible for the tone of opinion which prevailed here up to recent years. Papers throughout the State naturally take their cue from the party organs published at the capital, while the few papers identified with no party are wont to adapt themselves even more carefully to popular opinion upon general subjects.

The citations made in the earlier part of this chapter from the *Sentinel* and the *Journal* clearly show the spirit of their management in 1869. But it must not be inferred that the *Journal* has through all these years maintained the position occupied by it at that time. Had it done so, one may reasonably believe that the women of Indiana would before to-day have been enfranchised. On the contrary, that sheet has been very vacillating, speaking for or against the cause according to the principles of its managers, the paper having frequently changed hands; and until recently the principles of the same managers upon this question have been shifting; but for the last five or six years the *Journal* has been a consistent, though somewhat mild, supporter of woman suffrage.

On the contrary, the *Sentinel* had been constant in its opposition, until, about eight years since, Mr. Shoemaker becoming the manager, it announced a Sunday issue devoted to the interests of women. The pledge then made has been nobly kept, and although for a few months the *Sentinel* seemed to edit its week-day issues with a view to counteracting the possible good effect of its Sunday utterances, the better spirit gradually triumphed, until at last, so far as the woman question is concerned, the paper is from Sunday to Saturday in harmony with itself. For some time it gave one column in each Sunday issue to the control of the State Central Suffrage Committee, and printed two hundred copies of the column for special distribution among the country papers.

The *Saturday Herald*, established in 1873, under the editorial management of George C. Harding, deserves mention. From the outset, this paper was the advocate of woman's right to be paid for work done according to its market value, and to protect herself and her property by the ballot. Perhaps the best service rendered to women by Mr. Harding, was that of securing in 1874 Gertrude Garrison as assistant editor of the *Herald*. Mrs. Garrison is, beyond question, one of the ablest journalists Indiana can boast, and the influence of her pen in modifying the popular estimate of woman's capabilities has been incalculable. From 1874 she did half the work, editorial articles, locals, sketches, and all the varieties of writing required upon a weekly paper, but at her own request her name was not announced as associate editor until 1876. In this capacity she remained upon the *Herald* until January 1, 1880, when the paper passed from Mr. Harding's into other hands. During her connection with the *Herald*, if there was anything particularly strong in the paper, her associate received the credit. The public will not permit itself to believe a woman capable of humor, though I think Mrs. Garrison did as much to sustain the paper's reputation for wit as even Mr. Harding. A. H. Dooley succeeded Mr. Harding as editor of the *Saturday Herald*, and it remained under his management a sturdy advocate of woman's enfranchisement.

Digitized by Google

The *Saturday Review* was established by Mr. Harding in October, 1880, with Mrs. Garrison associate editor. Upon the death of Mr. Harding, May 8, 1881, Mr. Charles Dennis became chief editor, Mrs. Garrison * remaining on the staff as his assistant.

The *Times* was founded in June, 1881. From the first it devoted a column to notes on women's work. From September of that year there appeared in each Saturday issue a department devoted to the interests of women, particularly to woman suffrage, under the editorial management of May Wright Sewall. This department reäppeared in the weekly and was thus widely circulated among country readers. The *Times* is under the management of Colonel W. R. Holloway. Although from the first fair in its discussions of all reform questions, it did not avow itself to be an advocate of woman suffrage until the week after the public entertainment of the Equal Suffrage Society, 1881, when there appeared an editorial nearly one column in length, setting forth its views upon the whole subject. This editorial contained the following paragraph:

As the question is likely to become a prominent theme of discussion during the next few years, the *Times* will now say that it is decidedly and unequivocally in favor of woman suffrage. We believe that women have the same right to vote that men have, that it is impolitic and unjust to deprive them of the right, and that its free and full bestowal would conserve the welfare of society and the good of government.

In the daily *Evening News*, Mr. J. H. Holliday, with his editorial aids, has set himself to stem the tide of progress which he evidently thinks will, unless a manful endeavor on his part shall prevent it, bear all things down to ruin. The character of his efforts may be inferred from the following extracts which appeared in January and December of 1881:

We wish our legislators would go home and ponder this thing. Read the Bible and understand the scheme of creation. Read the New Testament, and appreciate the creation of the Christian home, and the headship of things. Reflect upon what rests the future of this government we have reared, and ask what would become of it if the Christian homes in which it is founded were broken up; then reflect upon what would become of the Christian homes if men and women were to attend to the same duties in life. To get a realistic notion, let every man who has a wife ask himself how he would relish being told by her, "I have an engagement with John Smith to-night to see about fixing up a slate to get Mrs. Jones nominated for sheriff," and being left to go his own way while she goes with Smith. If that wouldn't make hell in the household in one act we don't know what would, yet this is merely one little trivial episode of what this anti-christian woman suffrage scheme means.

To what straits must the advocates of suffrage for women be driven when they needs must seek to show that the ballot is not degrading. What becomes of all our fine talk of the ballot as an educator if they who seek to secure it for women must advocate as a reason why it should not be withheld that it is not degrading! But what better can one expect from those who, when it is suggested that there are duties attaching to the ballot as well as rights, solemnly say that the few moments necessary to deposit a ballot will not interfere with women's duties of sweeping and dusting and baby-tending. When one hears talk of this sort, there is indeed a grave doubt as to whether the ballot really is an educator after all.

The first of the above citations is from what might be called an article of instruction addressed to the legislature then in session, and considering

* Mrs. Garrison left Indianapolis for New York in May of 1882. Success followed her to the metropolis and she now has, 1885, the entire editorial management of the literary department of the American Press Association, and her work goes into more than fifty of the best weekly papers in the country.

the question of woman suffrage. The occasion which inspired the second paragraph may be readily inferred. It seems "profitable for the instruction" of the future to preserve a few extracts like the above, that it may be seen how weak and wild, strength itself becomes, when the ally of prejudice and precedent.

The *Indiana Farmer*, exceptionally well edited, having a wide circulation in the agricultural sections of the State, and enjoying there a powerful influence, is an outspoken advocate of equal suffrage. From statistics regarding papers published outside of Indianapolis, it may be safe to say that two hundred of them favor, with varying degrees of constancy, giving the ballot to women. On the staff of nearly all the papers whose status is above given, are women, who in their respective departments faithfully serve the common cause. During the last few years, efforts have been directed to the capture of the local press, and many of the county papers now have a department edited by women. In most instances this work is done gratuituously, and their success in this new line, entering upon it as they have without previous training, illustrates the versatility of woman's powers. Mrs. M. E. Price of Kokomo, Mrs. Sarah P. Franklin of Anderson, Mrs. Laura Sandafur of Franklin, and Mrs. Ida M. Harper of Terre Haute, deserve especial mention for their admirable work in the papers of their respective towns. Mrs. Laura C. Arnold is the chief editor of the Columbus *Democrat*, and is the only woman in the State having editorial charge of a political party paper. *Our Herald*, under the able editorial management of Mrs. Helen M. Gougar, was a weekly published at Lafayette. It was devoted to securing the re-passage and adoption of the woman suffrage and prohibition amendments. It was a strong, aggressive sheet, and deserved its almost unparalleled success.*

In closing this able report for Indiana a few facts in regard to the author may interest the general reader as well as the student of history.

Mrs. May Wright Sewall has been well known for many years in Indianapolis in the higher departments of education, and has recently crowned her efforts as a teacher by establishing a model classical school for girls, in which she is not only training their minds to vigorous thought, but taking the initiative steps to secure for them an equally vigorous physical development. Her pupils are required to wear a comfortable gymnastic costume, all their garments loosely resting on their shoulders; corsets, tight waists and high-heeled boots forbidden, for deep thinking requires deep breathing. The whole upper floor of her new building is a spacious gymnasium, where her pupils exercise every

* *Our Herald* did royal service in the campaign of 1882; it subsequently became a monthly and in addition to other admirable efforts, undertook to introduce leading western women to the larger world by publishing a series of biographical sketches of the most prominent. In the winter of 1885 Mrs. Gougar sold *Our Herald* to Mrs. Harbert, who published it in Chicago as the *The New Era*.

Digitized by Google

day under the instruction of a skillful German; and on every Saturday morning they take lessons from the best dancing master in the city. The result is, she has no dull scholars complaining of headaches. All are alike happy in their studies and amusements.

Mrs. Sewall is a preëminently common-sense woman, believing that sound theories can be put into practice. Although her tastes are decidedly literary and æsthetic, she is a radical reformer. Hence her services in the literary club and suffrage society are alike invaluable. And as chairman of the executive committee of the National Association, she is without her peer in planning and executing the work.

As her husband, Mr. Theodore L. Sewall, is also at the head of a classical school, and equally successful in training boys, it may be said that both institutions have the advantage of the united thought of man and woman. As educators, Mr. and Mrs. Sewall have reaped much practical wisdom from their mutual consultations and suggestions, the results of which have been of incalculable benefit to their pupils.

Peering into the homes of the young women in the suffrage movement, one cannot but remark the deference and respect with which these intelligent, self-reliant wives are uniformly treated by their husbands, and the unbounded confidence and affection they give in return. For happiness in domestic life, men and women must meet as equals. A position of inferiority and dependence for even the best organized women, will either wither all their powers and reduce them to apathetic machines, going the round of life's duties with a kind of hopeless dissatisfaction, or it will rouse a bitter antagonism, an active resistance, an offensive self-assertion, poisoning the very sources of domestic happiness. The true ideal of family life can never be realized until woman is restored to her rightful throne. Tennyson, in his "Princess," gives us the prophetic vision when he says:

> "Everywhere
> Two heads in council, two beside the hearth,
> Two in the tangled business of the world,
> Two in the liberal offices of life,
> Two plummets dropped for one, to sound the abyss
> Of science, and the secrets of the mind."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XLIII.

ILLINOIS.

Chicago a Great Commercial Center—First Woman Suffrage Agitation, 1855—A. J. Grover—Society at Earlville—Prudence Crandall—Sanitary Movement—Woman in Journalism—Myra Bradwell—Excitement in Elmwood Church, 1868—Mrs. Huldah Joy—Pulpit Utterances—Convention, 1869, Library Hall, Chicago—Anna Dickinson—Robert Laird Collier Debate—Manhood Suffrage Denounced by Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony—Judge Charles B. Waite on the Constitutional Convention—Hearing Before the Legislature—Western Suffrage Convention, Mrs. Livermore, President—Annual Meeting at Bloomington—Women Eligible to School Offices—Evanston College—Miss Alta Hulett—Medical Association—Dr. Sarah Hackett Stephenson—"Woman's Kingdom," in the *Inter-Ocean*—Mrs. Harbert—Centennial Celebration at Evanston—Temperance Petition, 180,000—Frances E. Willard—Social Science Association—Art Union—International Congress at Paris—Jane Graham Jones—Moline Association.

ILLINOIS, one of the Central States in our vast country, stretching over five and a half degrees of latitude, was admitted to the Union in 1818. Its chief city, Chicago, extending for miles round the southern shores of Lake Michigan, is the great commercial center of the boundless West. We may get some idea of the magnitude of her commerce from the fact that the receipts and shipment of flour, grain and cattle from that port alone in 1872 were valued at $370,000,000.

When the battles with the Indians were finally ended, the population of the State rapidly increased, and in 1880 the census gave 1,586,523 males and 1,491,348 females. In the school statistics we find about the same proportionate number of women and girls as teachers and scholars in the public schools and in all the honest walks of life; while men and boys in the criminal ranks are out of all proportion. For example, in the state-prison at Joliet there were, in 1873, 1,321 criminals; fifteen only were women. And yet the more virtuous, educated, self-governed part of the population, that shared equally the hardships of the early days, and by industry and self-sacrifice helped to build up that great State, is still denied the civil and political rights

Digitized by Google

declared by the constitution to belong to every citizen of the commonwealth. The trials and triumphs of the women of Illinois are vividly portrayed in the following records sent us by Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Ph. D.:

His biographer asserts that Bernini, the celebrated Florentine artist, architect, painter and poet, once gave a public opera in Rome, for which he painted the scenes, composed the music, wrote the poem, carved the statues, invented the engines, and built the theater. Because of his versatile talents the man Bernini has passed into history. Of almost equal versatility were the women of the equal-rights movement, since in many instances their names appear and reäppear in the records we have consulted as authors, editors, journalists, lecturers, teachers, physicians, lawyers, ordained ministers and home-makers; and in many localities a woman, to be eligible for the lyceum, was expected to be statesmanlike as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, executive as Susan B. Anthony, spiritual as Lucretia Mott, eloquent as Anna Dickinson, graceful as Celia Burleigh, fascinating as Paulina Wright Davis; a social queen, very domestic, a skillful musician, an excellent cook, very young, and the mother of at least six children; even then she was not entitled to the rights, privileges and immunities of an American citizen. So "the divine rights of the people" became the watchword of thoughtful men and women of the Prairie State, and at the dawn of the second half of the present century many caught the echoes of that historic convention at Seneca Falls and insisted that the fundamental principles of our government should be applied to all the citizens of the United States.

In view of the fearless heroism and steady adherence to principle of many comparatively unknown lives, the historian is painfully conscious of the meagerness of the record, as compared with the amount of labor that must necessarily have been performed. In almost every city, village and school district some earnest man or woman has been quietly waging the great moral battle that will eventually make us free; and while it would be a labor of love to recognize every one who has wrought for freedom, doubtless many names worthy of mention may unintentionally be omitted.

The earliest account of specific work that we have been able to trace is an address delivered in Earlville by A. J. Grover, esq., in 1855, who from that time until the present has been an able champion of the constitutional rights of women. As a result of his efforts, and the discussion that followed, a society was formed, of which Mrs. Susan Hoxie Richardson (a cousin of Susan B. Anthony) was elected president, and Mrs. Octavia Grover secretary. This, we believe, was the first suffrage society in Illinois. Its influence was increased by the fact that, during two years of Mr. Grover's editorial control, the Earlville *Transcript* was a fearless champion of equal rights. While that band of pioneers was actively at work, Prudence Crandall, who was mobbed and imprisoned in Connecticut for teaching a school for colored girls, was actively engaged in Men-

dota, in the same county. A few years later, lectures were delivered * on the subject of equal rights for women in different parts of the State.

Copies of two of the early appeals have been secured. One by A. J. Grover, published in pamphlet form, was extensively circulated; the other by Mrs. Catharine V. Waite, appeared in the Earlville *Transcript*. Both of these documents are yellowed with age, but the arguments presented are as logical as the more recent utterances of our most radical champions. There is a tradition of a convention at Galesburg some years later, but we have failed to find any accurate data. During the interim between these dates and that never-to-be-forgotten April day in 1861, but little agitation of this great subject can be traced, and during the six years subsequent to that time we witness all previously defined boundaries of spheres brushed away like cobwebs, when women, north and south, were obliged to fill the places made vacant by our civil war. An adequate record of the work accomplished during those eventful years by Illinois women, notably among them being Mary A. Livermore and Jane C. Hoge, lies before us in a bound volume of the paper published under the auspices of the Northwestern Sanitary Fair, edited by the Hon. Andrew Shuman. This little journal was called the *Voice of the Fair*, a prophetic name, as really through the medium of these sanitary fairs were the voices of the *fair* all potent, and through their patriotic services to our soldiery did the women of the United States first discover their talent for managing and administering great enterprises. In his first editorial Lieutenant-Governor Shuman says:

> On motion of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Loomis, it was decided to open the fair on February 22, 1865, Washington's birthday, and to continue it till March 4, the presidential inauguration day. A committee, consisting of Mrs. H. H. Hoge, Mrs. D. P. Livermore and Mrs. E. W. Blatchford for the commission, and Mrs. O. E. Hosmer, Mrs. C. P. Dickinson and Mr. L. B. Bryan for the Home, was appointed as executive. This was the little cloud, scarcely larger than a man's hand, which grew till it almost encircled the heavens, spreading into every corner of our broad land, and including every department of industry in its ample details.

The undertaking was herculean, and on the grand occasion of the opening of the fair, although we do not find any account of women sharing in the honors of the day, yet they were vouchsafed honorable mention in the following terms by the governor of the State: "I do not know how to praise women, but I can say nothing so good as our late president once said on a similar occasion, 'God bless the women of America.' They have been our faithful allies during this fearful war. They have toiled steadily by our side, with the most enduring constancy through the frightful contest." Amid the first impulses of genuine gratitude men recognized what at present they seem to forget, that by inheritance and patriotic service woman has an equal right with man to a share in the rights and privileges of this government.

In the winter of 1860 Hannah Tracy Cutler, M. D., and Mrs. Frances D. Gage made a canvass of the interior and western parts of the State, pro-

* Judge and Mrs. Catharine V. Waite, Mrs. Hannah M. Tracy Cutler, Amelia Bloomer, Dr. Ellen B. Ferguson, Mrs. E. O. G. Willard, the Rev. Mr. and Mrs. Harrison of Earlville; Professor and Mrs. D. L. Brooks, Mrs. M. E. De Geer, Mrs. Frances D. Gage.

Digitized by Google

curing signatures to petitions asking for equality before the law, and especially for the right of married women to earn and hold and dispose of property the same as a *feme sole*. Also, that property acquired before marriage, or that may afterward accrue to a married woman by gift, devise, descent or deed, may be held, controlled and disposed of by herself where it had not been intentionally converted to common property by her consent. In response to a request for data on this point, Mrs. Cutler writes:

At the close of our campaign we were summoned to Ohio to assist in the canvass in that State. Returning to Illinois, I learned that no action had been taken on our petitions. The member to whom we had consigned them, and who had promised to act in our behalf, had found no convenient opportunity. I at once repaired to Springfield, and, on inquiry, was told that it was now too late in the session—that members were so busy that no one could be induced to draft a bill for an act granting such laws as we desired. I found one member ready to assist to the full measure of his ability—Mr. Pickett of Rock Island. By his encouragement I went to the State library and there drew up a bill giving women, during coverture, certain personal and property rights. Mr. Pickett presented our petitions, got a special committee, took my bill before it, got a favorable report, and a law was passed to that effect. Some decisions occurred under this law. I think, however, that in a codification a year or two after, this law was left out, I know not by what authority, and some years later Mrs. Livermore, Mrs. Bradwell and others presented the matter afresh, and succeeded in procuring again a similar enactment. The winter following I presented petitions for the right of guardianship; also, I asked that for estates not exceeding $5,000 the widow should not be required to take out letters of administration, but should be permitted to continue in possession, the same as the husband on the decease of the wife, the property subject to the same liabilities for the payment of debts and the maintenance of children as before the decease of the husband. I made this small claim for the relief of many wives whose husbands had gone into the army, leaving them with all the responsibility; and there seemed no sufficient reason for disturbing and distributing either the family or the estate, when the husband exchanged the battle-field for the "sleep that knows no waking." This petition, asking for these reasonable and righteous laws, was, by motion of Colonel Mack, in a spirit of burlesque, referred to the Committee on Internal Navigation, and a burlesque report was made in open Senate, too indecent to be entered on the records. The grave and reverend seigniors, on this, indulged in a hearty guffaw, hugely enjoyed by his honor Lieutenant-Governor Hoffman, and, to this day, no further action has been taken to give the wife and mother this small modicum of justice, though many of the senators at that time promised the question an early consideration.

On Saturday, October 3, 1868, a genuine sensation was produced by the appearance of the Chicago *Legal News*, edited by Mrs. Myra Bradwell. At this day it is impossible to realize with what supreme astonishment this journal was received. Neither can we estimate its influence upon the subsequent legislation of the State. Looking through its files we find that no opportunity was lost for exposing all laws unjust to woman, or for noting each indication of progress throughout the world. Under date of October 31, 1868, a short article in regard to the "Citizenship of Women" reads thus:

The act of congress provides that any alien, being a free white person, may become a citizen of the United States. While congress was very careful to limit this great privilege of citizenship to the free white person, it made no distinction or limitation whatever on account of sex. Under this statute it has been held that a married woman

may be naturalized and become a citizen of the United States, and that, too, without the consent of her husband. A woman may be a citizen of the United States, be subject to the laws, own property, and be compelled to pay taxes to support a government she has no voice in administering or vote in electing its officers.

In the same issue of the *News* we meet with an earnest appeal for the prompt passage of a law conferring upon woman a right to her earnings. When we realize that one of the Supreme Judges soon after this assured Mrs. Bradwell that she was editing a paper that no lawyer could afford to do without, we shall understand how important a part this journal has played in the courts. In the sixth number of the *News* we find the attention of the legal fraternity called to the fact that in the reign of James I. it was held in the cases of *Coats vs. Lyall* and *Holt vs. Lyall*, tried in Westminster Hall, that a single woman, if a freeholder, had the right to vote for a parliament man; and in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Lady Packington, in right of property held by her, did actually vote for a return of two burgesses to parliament for the borough of Aylesburg; and in the time of Charles I., Mrs. Copley voted, in right of her property, for the return of a burgess for Gratton. The subject of their return was brought before parliament, and amended by joining other persons with Mrs. Copley in the right of returning burgesses for Gratton. Women have actually sat and voted in the English parliament.

In 1868, Sorosis, a woman's club, was organized in Chicago, with Mrs. Delia Waterman president, and soon after several periodicals were established; *The Chicago Sorosis*, with Mrs. Mary L. Walker, Cynthia Leonard and Agnes L. Knowlton, editors; *The Inland Monthly*, Mrs. Charlotte Clark, editor and publisher; and *The Agitator*, with Mary A. Livermore and Mary L. Walker editors. Though all were short-lived, they serve to show woman's ambition in the direction of journalism.

In 1868 there was a decided "awakening" on the question of woman suffrage in central Illinois. In the town of Elmwood, Peoria county, the question drew large audiences to lyceum discussions, and was argued in school, church and caucus. The conservatives became alarmed, and announced their determination to "nip the innovation in the bud." A spirited editorial in the New York *Independent* was based upon the following facts, given by request of some of the disfranchised women:

Rev. W. G. Pierce was the pastor of the Elmwood Congregational Church. A large majority of the members were women, and there was no discrimination against them in the church manual. The pastor and two or three members decided that a change of rules was needed. A church meeting was held in March, 1868, at which the number in attendance was very small, owing to some irregularities in issuing the call. The suffrage question was brought up by the pastor, and the talk soon became so insulting that the women present felt compelled to leave the house. The manual was then amended so as to exclude women from voting "in matters pertaining to the welfare of the church," and making a two-thirds vote of adult males necessary to any change thereafter. This was carried by five yeas to one nay—only six votes out of a membership of 210! The church was taken by surprise, and there was no little excitement when the fact became known next day. A vigorous protest and a call for reconsideration was quickly signed by nearly a hundred members and sent to the pastor. The meeting was not called for weeks, and when at last it was secured, he, as moderator, ruled reconsideration out, on the ground that there was an error in the announcement

Digitized by Google

of the business (by himself !) from the pulpit. At a later meeting a vote on reconsideration was reached, and enough of the male adult minority were in attendance to make the vote stand 19 to 17, not two-thirds of the male adult element voting for reconsideration.

The contention now became bitter, and twenty-eight of the more intelligent and earnest members withdrew and asked for letters to other churches. Such of the "adult males" as "tarried by the altar," refused to give the outgoing members the usual letters, to join in a mutual council on an equal footing, or to discipline the seceders. The latter called an ex-parte council, composed of such men as Dr. Bascom, of Princeton; Dr. Edward Beecher, of Galesburg; Dr. Haven, of Evanston; Dr. C. D. Helmer, of Chicago, and others. This council gave the desired letters, but advised reconciliation. Among the seceders, Mrs. Huldah Joy, an educated and intensely religious woman, was one of the most active and earnest, her husband, F. R. Joy, and her daughters, also doing good service. Mrs. H. E. Sunderland,* another woman of culture, and Mrs. Mary Ann Cone and Mrs. S. R. Murray were faithful, brave and earnest. The church, which previous to the secession, was strong and flourishing, became an inharmonious organization, and has never rallied from the effects of that unjust action.

At a meeting held in Chicago, in the autumn of 1868, a resolution was offered to the effect that "a State association be formed, having for its object the advocacy of universal suffrage." Among the many interesting facts connected with the "rise and progress" of the equal-rights movement is the large number of representative men and women who have from the first been identified with it.† January 25, 1860 we find among the most progressive utterances from the pulpit, a sermon by the Rev. Sumner Ellis of Chicago, while Rev. Charles Fowler and Dr. H. W. Thomas were ever fearless and earnest in their advocacy of this measure. In February, 1869, the *Legal News* said:

---

* Mrs. Sunderland was one of the many New England girls who in the early days went West to teach. Speaking of the large number of women elected to the office of county superintendent (one of them her own daughter), she told me that thirty years ago when she arrived at the settlement where she had been engaged as teacher, the trustees being unable to make the "examination" deputed one of their number to take her to an adjoining county, where another New England girl was teaching. The excursion was made in a lumber wagon with an ox-team. All the ordinary questions asked and promptly answered, the trustee rather hesitatingly said, "Now, while you're about it, wouldn't you just as lief write out the certificate?" This was readily done, and the man affixing his cross thereto, triumphantly carried the applicant back to his district, announcing her duly qualified to teach; and that trio of unlettered men installed the cultivated New England girl in their log school-house, probably without the thought entering the heads of trustees or teacher, that woman, when better educated, should hold the superior position.—[S. B. A.

† Dr. Mary Safford, Mrs. A. M. Freeman, Hon. and Mrs. Sharon Tyndale, Hon. E. Haines, Fernando Jones, Jane Graham Jones, Professor Bailey, Mr. and Mrs. Ezra Prince, Mr. and Mrs. R. M. Fell, Mrs. Belle S. Candee, General J. M. Thompson, Mrs. Professor Noyes of Evanston, Charles B. Waite, Catharine V. Waite, Susan Bronson, E. S. Williams, Kate N. Doggett, C. B. Farwell, L. Z. Leiter, J. L. Pickard, Henry M. Smith, Frank Gilbert, Ann Telford, Mrs. L. C. Levanway, Myra Bradwell, Mary E. Haven, Mrs. A. L. Taylor, Elizabeth Eggleston, P. D. Livermore, James B. Bradwell, Joseph Haven, J. H. Bayliss, D. Blakely, R. E. Hoyt, C. D. Helmer, Alfred L. Sewell, George D. Willigton, H. Allen, R. N. Foster, W. W. Smith, M. B. Smith, Amos G. Throop, Robert Collyer, L. I. Colburn, G. Percy English, Arthur Edwards, A. Reed and Sons, S. M. Booth, Sumner Ellis, George B. Marsh, Sarah Marsh, Ruth Graham, John Nutt, J. W. Butler, Mrs. J. Butler, Mrs. S. A. Richards, Mrs. S. W. Roe, F. W. Hall, Mrs. Fanny Blake, Mary S. Waite, J. F. Temple, A. W. Kellogg, W. H. Thomson, J. W. Loomis, James E. Curtis, Elizabeth Johnston, E. F. Hurlbut, E. E. Pratt, Mrs. E. M. Warren, William Doggett, Edward Beecher, James P. Weston, E. R. Allen, J. E. Forrester, Mrs. J. F. Temple, Mrs. F. W. Adams, L. Walker, Mary A. Whitaker, Elvira W. Ruggles, W. W. Corbett, H. B. Norton, W. H. Davis, I. S. Dennis, G. T. Flanders, Mrs. H. B. Manford, Edward Eggleston, Sarah G. Cleveland, G. G. Lyon, E. Manford, William D. Babbitt, Elizabeth Holt Babbitt, I. S. Page, W. O. Carpenter, Mrs. W. O. Carpenter, Mrs. H. W. Cobb, T. D. Fitch, Harriet Fitch, Mary A. Livermore, T. W. Eddy, A. G. Brackett, Andrew Shuman, John A. Jameson, John V. Farwell, B. W. Raymond, E. G. Taylor, Mems Root and lady, Rev. John McLean, Mrs. Owen Lovejoy, Mrs. Noyes Kendall.

A call has been issued, inviting all persons in favor of woman suffrage to meet in convention in Library Hall, Chicago. There are many hundred names appended, including the judges of all the courts of Cook county, leading members of the bar throughout the State, representatives of the press, ministers of the gospel, from all denominations, and representatives from every profession and business. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and the Rev. Olympia Brown have been invited and are expected to attend.

Pursuant to the foregoing "call," a notable convention was held.* The *Tribune* devoted nine columns to an account of the proceedings, respectful in tone and fair in statement. During its two days' session, Library Hall was packed to its utmost capacity with the beauty and fashion of the city. Able lawyers, eloquent and distinguished divines and gallant generals occupied seats upon the platform and took part in the deliberations. The special importance of this convention at this time, was the consideration of the immediate duty of securing a recognition of the rights of women in the new constitution, for the framing of which a convention had been called.

All the speakers had strong convictions and showed broad differences, continually making sharp points against each other. Several clergymen were present, some in favor of woman suffrage, some opposed, some in doubt. Among these were the two Collyers—one, the Rev. Robert, the English blacksmith of former days, liberal, progressive, of large physical proportions; the other, the Rev. Robert Laird, a much smaller man, and of conservative tendencies.

The Rev. Robert Collyer dissented so entirely from what the preceding speaker, Dr. Hammond, had said, that he was determined to run the risk of attempting to reply. He thought that a majority of men who began by being reformers, ended by being old fogies, and he thought that might be the case with Mr. Hammond. He felt no doubt that the whole movement of women's rights was to be established in America. He had seen the effects of woman's presence in associations upon men, and he was sure that this same agency would have the effect of bringing politics to such a condition as that decent people of either sex might take part in it. As to the Bible declaring that man shall rule over woman, he found a similar case where it used to be quoted in support of the institution of slavery, but when the grander and more beautiful principles of the Bible came to be applied the contrary was clearly established. So it was with the question of woman's rights. To him the Bible seemed like an immense pasture wherein any and every species of animal might find its own peculiar food. In regard to what Mr. Hammond said as to the rights of infants, he wished he had conferred with his wife and got her approval before he said it. The speaker was sure his own wife would not have advised him to say it. He believed that when maternal and home duties conflicted, the children and the home relations would take the preference invariably, and the remarks of Mr. Hammond seemed to imply a terrible want of confidence in woman. He believed that woman would always do her duty to her children and her home. Then, too, he had been surprised, that Mr. Hammond, in speaking of preventing children from coming into the world, had failed to speak of

* The officers were: *President*, Mrs. M. Livermore; *Vice-Presidents*, the Rev. Dr. Goodspeed, Mrs. Helen M. Beveridge, Judge Bradwell, the Rev. Edward Beecher, the Rev. D. Eggleston, Miss Eliza Bowman, the Rev. Dr. Fowler, Mrs. Elizabeth Loomis, Mrs. M. Hawley, Mrs. M. Wheeler, Mrs. Myra Bradwell; *Secretaries*, Mrs. Jeanne Fowler Willing, of Rockford, Mrs. Elizabeth Babbitt, and George Graham, Esq.; *Committee on Finance*, Judge Bradwell, General Beveridge and the Hon. S. M. Booth. The speakers were Anna Dickinson, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Rev. Robert Collyer, Rev. Mr. Hammond, Rev. Robert Laird Collier, Kate N. Doggett, and many of the officers of the convention.

the complicity of man, in reality the greatest criminal, in that matter. As to the excitement attendant upon political issues, was it worse, viewed as mere excitement, than that which is so earnestly sought to be aroused at religious meetings? Elizabeth, Anne, and Victoria were, with the exception, perhaps, of Cromwell, the best rulers England ever had, and, when the administration of Andrew Johnson was remembered, he thought we might do worse than to have a woman for president, after Grant's term shall have expired. [Applause.] In conclusion, Mr. Collyer said that, even if the fearful picture drawn by Mr. Hammond, of 70,000 immoral women marching to the polls in New York, were realized, he could draw another picture—that of 75,000 good and pure women marching to the polls to vote the others down. [Applause.]

Rev. Edward Beecher, of Galesburg, said: Exclusive class legislation was not safe; it was oppressive and degrading. Female influence has procured the repeal of some obnoxious laws, and that proved it was a powerful element. He thought the Bible, as regards man being the head, had been misinterpreted. When man took the attitude in relation to women which Christ sustains to the church, that of love, of service, of helpfulness and sacrifice, he would be an example of true headship. He read an extract from an editorial in the *Tribune*, of February 11, in regard to the giving way of moral integrity in the affairs of the nation, and commended the question to the consideration of all. The country was never in greater danger than now of having the whole political system destroyed. Some great moral influence ought to be brought to eradicate the corruption so prevalent among public men. There were two great vices in existence—drunkenness and licentiousness—and in both, woman was the victim of man in the majority of cases. The legislation which pressed down women was wrong, and should be remedied. He admitted it was an experiment to introduce the female element into legislation, but the success of the male element had thus far been such that, according to his judgment, things could not be much worse than they are. Women were always deeply interested in all public questions. If responsibilities were put upon them they would become greater intellectually, morally and socially.

Several able lawyers also took part in the convention, who brought their legal learning to bear on the question. Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony, hostile to the action of the Republican party as manifested in the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, were present with their stern criticisms and scathing resolutions on "manhood suffrage," submitting the following to the convention:

Resolved, That a man's government is worse than a white man's government, because in proportion as you increase the rulers you make the condition of the ostracised more hopeless and degraded.

Resolved, That as the Democratic cry of "a white man's government" created an antagonism between the Irish and the negro, culminating in the New York riots of '63, so the Republican cry of "manhood suffrage" creates an antagonism between the black man and all women, and will culminate in fearful outrages on womanhood, especially in the Southern States.

Resolved, That by the establishment of an aristocracy of sex in the District of Columbia, by the introduction of the word "male" into the federal constitution in article XIV., section 2, and by the proposition to enforce manhood suffrage in all the States of the Union, the Republican party has been guilty of three successive arbitrary acts, three retrogressive steps in legislation, alike invidious and insulting to women and suicidal to the nation.

After a long and earnest discussion, the resolutions were voted down. Mrs. Stanton's speech setting forth six reasons against a "male aristocracy"* was pronounced able and eloquent, though directly in opposition to the general sentiment of the convention, which was mainly Republi-

* For this speech see Vol. II., page 348.

can. Miss Anna Dickinson, having a lyceum engagement in Chicago, was present at one of the sessions, and had quite a spirited encounter with Robert Laird Collier. As she appeared on the platform at the close of some remarks by that gentleman, loud calls were made for her, when she came forward and spoke as follows:

MRS. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is impossible for me to continue in my seat after so kind and cordial a call from this house, and I thank you for the pleasant and friendly feeling you have shown. I have but a word to say. I had gone out of the room, not because of the discussion, but because it was too warm and the atmosphere so stifling, when I was recalled by hearing something to this effect: "That there had not been a single logical argument used on this platform in behalf of woman suffrage; that woman is abundantly represented by some man of her family; that when a woman lifts herself up in opposition against her husband, she lifts herself up, if I properly and rightly understood the declaration, against God; that the inspired assertion is that the husband is the head of the wife." Oh! but Mr. Collier forgot to say the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. In my observation, and it has not been a limited one, though I confess I am not an unprejudiced observer, I have never yet discovered a man who is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church. Furthermore, he announces that these women, being represented by men, if they lift themselves up in opposition to their husbands, lose that womanly and feminine element which is so admirable and pure and beautiful, and nothing can preserve them from the contamination of politics. Woman is to lift herself against God if she lifts herself against her husband, and woman is abundantly represented by this same husband, or by some man in her own family. There are a multitude of women who have no husbands [laughter]. There are a multitude of women who never will have any husbands [renewed laughter]. There are a great many women who have no men in their own households to represent them, either for their wrongs or their rights. Mr. Collier, I suppose, however, is talking about women who have husbands.

He says the woman loses her purity, her delicacy, her feminine attributes when she lifts her voice and sentiments against the man whose name she bears. We will say, then, look across these western prairies to Utah. If the women there dare to say to the congress of the United States, "Amend this constitution that we women of Utah can have one husband, and that the husband can take but one wife"; if these women demand decency in the marriage relation, demand justice for themselves, demand purity, they are lifting themselves against the laws of womanhood and the laws of God. Every woman represented by her husband is to lose her purity, her delicacy, her refinement, if she dares to lift her hand against him and his will. You have here, within the limits of your State of Illinois, 100,000 drunkards. Every woman who dares to lift her hand, cry out with her voice, "Give me the ballot that may offset the votes of these drunkards at the polls and save my children from starvation and myself from being put into the workhouse"—this woman is lifting herself against the laws of God and womanhood. That is not all! Last summer this question of prohibition was being tested in Massachusetts by votes. I went from town to town—my engagements taking me all over the State at that time—and said my say upon this question of woman suffrage. In whatever city or town I went, women, bowed down with grief, who desired to preserve their womanhood, their persons from blows and abuse, their sons from going to gambling hells and rum shops, their girls from being sent to houses of abomination, came to me and said: "Anna Dickinson, if you are a woman, speak and use your influence for our cause." Women who have drunken husbands, whether they lived in Beacon street or at the North End, whether they lived in luxury or poverty, said: "For the sake of womanhood, for the sake of motherhood, for the sake of all things good and true in the world, lift up our hands and voices, through yourself, to protest against these men whose names we bear." Ah! that Mr. Collier could have seen these drunkards' wives, standing with tears streaming down their

Digitized by Google

cheeks, and begging for power, begging for the ballot to save their homes, and themselves, and their children. Do you tell this audience—do you tell any mother or daughter here this afternoon, that she protests against the purity of womanhood, and lifts her powers against the laws of God? Pardon me for taking this much of your time. I will simply add a thought. This is the cause of purity. This is the cause which is to strengthen young girls, which is to give them self-reliance and self-respect. This is the thing that is to put these girls on their feet; say to them "you are an independent being; you are to earn the clothes that cover you," and this will allow them to walk with steady feet through rough places. This thing which is to give these women such power, certainly will be strengthening to them by making them independent and self-reliant. The ballot is to save womanhood and save purity, which he says is in danger—the feminine element of dependence and weakness and tenderness, of clinging helplessness, which he so much adores. Let justice be done. Give us the ballot. Here is the power to defend yourself when your rights are assailed; when your home is entered. Here is the authority to tell the spoiler to stand back; when our sons are being brought up to wickedness and our daughters to lives of shame, here is the power in the mother's hand which says these children shall be taken from the wrong place and put in the right one. For the rights of mothers I plead. Let us allow, from one end of this country to the other, every man and woman, black and white, to go to the polls to defend their own rights and the rights of their homes.

The Rev. R. L. COLLIER said he would to God that every woman in America had such a heart and such a voice for woman's rights. But sympathy was one thing and logic was another. If he thought the ballot in the hand of woman would cure the wrongs she speaks of, he would favor female suffrage, but he was firmly convinced that it would only aggravate their wrongs. He could not fight Anna Dickinson.

ANNA DICKINSON: I certainly do not intend to fight Mr. Collier. I believe I have the name of not being a belligerent woman. Mr. Collier says sympathy is one thing and logic is another. Very true! I did not speak of the 40,000 women in the State of Massachusetts who are wives of drunkards, as a matter which shall appeal to your sympathies, or move your tears. Mr. Collier says that these women are to find their rights by influence at home.

Mr. COLLIER: That is what I mean.

Miss DICKINSON: That they are to do it by womanly and feminine love, and I tell him that is the duty of this same feminine element which is so admirable and adorable. I have seen men on your street corners, as I have seen men on the street corners of every city of America, with bloated faces, with mangled forms, and eyes blackened by the horrible vice and orgies carried on in their dens of iniquity and drunkenness and sin. I have seen men with not a semblance of humanity in their form or in their face, and not a sentiment of manhood in their souls. I have seen these men made absolute masters of wives and children; men who reel to their homes night after night to beat some helpless child; to beat some helpless woman. A woman was beaten here in Chicago the other day until there was scarcely a trace of the woman's face left, and scarcely a trace of the woman's form remaining. Mr. Collier tells me, then, that these women whose husbands reel home at 12, 1, 2, 3 o'clock at night, to demolish the furniture, beat the children, and destroy their wives' peace and lives—that these women are to find their rights by influence, by argument, by tenderness. These brutes who deserve the gallows if any human being can deserve anything so atrocious in these days—are these women, their wives, to find their safety, their security for themselves and their children, by influence, through argument and tenderness, or love, when nothing can influence save drink? The law gives man the power to say, "I will have drink; I will put this into my mouth." If the ballot were given to women they would vote against drunkenness. It is not sentiment, it is logic, if there be any logic in votes and in a home saved.

The Rev. R. L. COLLIER, in reply to Miss Dickinson, quoted a story from an English author of a drunkard who was reclaimed by a daughter's love and devotion. He never wanted to hear a woman say that law could accomplish what love could not.

Miss DICKINSON: I only want to ask Mr. Collier a question, and it is this: Whether he does not think that man would have been a great deal better off if this woman's vote could have offset his vote, and the rum thereby prevented from being sold at the outset?

Mr. COLLIER: I wish to say that law never yet cured crime; that men are not our only drunkards. Women are drunkards as well as men.

Miss DICKINSON (excitedly): It is not so, in anything like the same proportion; a drunken woman is a rare sight.

Mr. COLLIER: I wish to say that intemperance can never be cured by law.

Miss DICKINSON: Very well. You tell me that there are woman in the land who are drunkards. Doubtless there are. Then I stand here as a woman to entreat, to beseech, to pray against this sin. For the sake of these drunken woman, I ask the ballot to drag them back from the rum-shops and shut their doors [applause]. God forbid that I should underrate the power of love; that I should discard tenderness. Let us have entreaty, let us have prayers, and let us have the ballot, to eradicate this evil. Mr. Collier says he is full of sympathy, and intimates that women should stand here and elevate love above law. So long as a man can be influenced by love, well and good. When a man has sunk to the point where he beats his wife and children, and burns the house over them, reduces his family to starvation to get this accursed drink; when a man has sunk to such a level, is woman to stand still and entreat? Is this all woman is to do? No! She is to have the power added that will drag the firebrand out of his hand, and when sense and reason return, when the fire is extinguished, then, I say, let us have the power of love to interfere. I think keeping a man out of sin is better than trying to drag him out afterward by love.

Mr. COLLIER said he was placed in a false position of prominence because, unfortunately, he was the only gentleman on the platform who entertained serious convictions on the negative side of the subject. The only question was, would the ballot cure these wrongs? If so, he would like to hear the reasons, philosophical and logical, set forth. The appeals that had been made to the convention were illogical and sympathetic. He believed the persecutors of women were women. Fashion and the prejudice in the minds of women had been the barriers to their own elevation. That the ballot in the hands of women would cure these evils he denied.

Miss DICKINSON: Mr. Collier says, "The worst enemies of women are women"; that the worst opponents of this measure are fashion, dress and idleness. I confess there are no bitterer opponents or enemies of this measure than women. On that very ground I assert that the ballot will prove woman's best friend. If woman has something else to think about than simply to please men, something else than the splendor of her diamonds, or the magnificence of her carriage, you may be sure, with broader fields to survey, it would be a good thing for her. If women could earn their bread and buy the houses over their heads, in honorable and lucrative avocations; if they stood in the eye of the law men's equals, there would be better work, more hopeful hearts, more Christian magnanimity, and less petty selfishness and meanness than, I confess with sorrow and tears, are found among women to-day.

One of the ablest speeches of the convention was made by Judge Chas. B. Waite, on woman's position before the law. Immediately after this enthusiastic convention * the Illinois State Suffrage Association was formed, a committee † appointed to visit Springfield and request the legislature to so "change the laws that the earnings of a married woman may be se-

* The officers of the convention were: *President*, Mary A. Livermore; *Vice-Presidents*, the Rev. Robert Collyer, Professor Haven; *Recording Secretary*, Jeanne Willing, of Rockford; *Corresponding Secretary*, Myra Bradwell; *Executive Committee*, Professor Haven, chairman; the Rev. Dr. Edward Beecher, Elizabeth J. Loomis, Hannah B. Manford, the Rev. E. Eggleston, the Rev. C. H. Fowler the Rev. E. J. Goodspeed, Rebecca Mott, Charlotte L. Levanway.

† The committee to visit Springfield were Hon. James B. Bradwell, Mrs. Myra Bradwell, Mrs. Kate N. Doggett, the Rev. E. Goodspeed, the Hon. C. B. Waite, and Mrs. Rebecca Mott.

Digitized by Google

cured to her own use; that married women may have the same right to their own property that married men have; and that the mother may have an equal right with the father to the custody of the children." The need of such a committee existed in that year of 1869, and they seemed to have wrought effective service, since on March 24 the married woman's earnings act was approved.

AN ACT *in Relation to the Earnings of Married Women.*

SEC. 1.—Be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly, That a married woman shall be entitled to receive, use and possess her own earnings, and sue for the same in her own name, free from the interference of her husband or his creditors: *Provided*, This act shall not be construed to give to the wife any compensation for any labor performed for her minor children or husband.

Mrs. Livermore, Mrs. Stanton, Judge Waite, Judge and Mrs. Bradwell, had an enthusiastic meeting in the Opera House, Springfield, most of the members of the legislature being present.

September 9, 10, 1869, the Western Convention was held in Library Hall, Chicago; Mrs. Livermore presided. This influential gathering was largely attended by leading friends from other States.* Mrs. Kate Doggett and Dr. Mary Safford were appointed to attend the Woman's Industrial Congress at Berlin. Letters were read from Wm. Lloyd Garrison and others.†

February 8, 9, 1870, the first annual meeting of the State Association was held at Springfield in the Opera House, Hon. James B. Bradwell in the chair. Many members of the legislature were present during the various sessions and a hearing‡ before the House was granted next day. Resolutions were discussed and adopted, declaring that women were enfranchised under the fourteenth amendment. As a constitutional convention was in session, and there was an effort being made to have an amendment for woman suffrage submitted to a vote of the people, greater interest was felt in all that was said at this convention.

The strange inconsistency of the opponents of woman suffrage was perhaps never more fully illustrated than by the following occurrence: While the patriotic and earnest women of Illinois were quietly acting upon the advice of their representatives, and relying upon their "quiet, moral influence" to secure a just recognition of their rights in the constitutional convention, a conservative woman of Michigan, who, afraid that the women of Illinois were about to lose their womanliness by asking for the right to have their opinions counted, deserted her home in the Peninsular State, went to Springfield, secured the hall of the convention, and gave two lectures against woman suffrage. A meeting was called at the close

* *Indiana*—Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Dr. Mary Wilhite, Emma Mallory, and Amanda Way; *Missouri*—Rebecca N. Hazzard; *Wisconsin*—Lelia Peckham; *Iowa*—Mary Newbury Adams, Matilda Fletcher; *Minnesota*—Mrs. Bishop; *Kansas*—Mrs. Henry; *Ohio*—Margaret V. Longley; *Michigan*—Professor Stone; *Massachusetts*—Henry B. Blackwell, and Lucy Stone; *New York*—Susan B. Anthony, most of whom took part in the discussions.

† Letters were also received from Paulina Wright Davis, Frederick Douglass, Hon. Sharon Tyndale, Rev. D. H. N. Powers, Mrs. Arabella Mansfield, Rev. Willis Lord.

‡ The speakers were Mrs. Livermore, Mrs. Stone, Hon. Sharon Tyndale, Hon. E. Haines, and Judge Bradwell.

of the second lecture, and in a resolution moved by a member of the convention, as Mrs. Bradwell pertinently says, "the people of the State were told that *one woman* had proved herself competent and well qualified to enlighten the constitutional convention upon the evils of woman suffrage." * Such was the effect of this self-appointed obtruder from another State that the members of the convention, without giving a woman of their own State opportunity for reply, not only struck out the clause submitting the question to the people in a separate article, but actually incorporated in the body of the constitution a clause which would not allow a woman to hold any office, public position, place of trust or emolument in the State. Through the efforts of such staunch friends as Judge Bradwell, Judge Waite and others, this latter clause was stricken out, and one inserted which, under a fair construction, will allow a woman to hold almost any office, provided she receives a sufficient number of votes.

By the accidental insertion of another clause in the constitution under consideration, Section 1, of Article VII., any foreign born woman, naturalized previous to January, 1870, was given the right to vote. So that Illinois was the first State in the Union, since the time when the women of New Jersey were disfranchised, to give to foreign-born women the elective franchise. This mistake of the wise Solons was guarded as a State secret.

Previous to the great fire of 1871, the most popular and influential woman's club in Chicago was the organization known as Sorosis. This club, by the generous aid of many prominent gentlemen of the city, established pleasant headquarters, where, in addition to bright carpets and artistic decorations, were books, flowers, birds, and other refined accessories. Mrs. Elizabeth Loomis says of the meetings held in those delightful parlors: "At every successive session we could see that we were gaining ground and receiving influential members. I well remember how it encouraged us to number the Rev. Dr. Thomas among our friends; and how gladly I made the motion to have him appointed temporary chairman in the absence of the president—a position which he cheerfully accepted." One of the most brilliant reünions ever enjoyed by the club, was a reception given to Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony, as they were *en route* to California, early in June, 1871. Of this reception, Miss Anthony, in a letter from Des Moines, Iowa, to *The Revolution*, said: "Mrs. Stanton and I were in Chicago the evening the Illinois State and Cook County Association held their opening reception at their new central bureau, a suite of fine rooms handsomly carpeted and furnished by prominent merchants of the city, where, with music, conversation, speeches, etc., the hours passed delightfully away," forming, as Miss Anthony might have added, a delightful oasis amid the many discomforts of a continuous appeal to the people to deal justly.

In November, 1871, Mrs. Catharine V. Waite, of Hyde Park, made a written application to the board of registration, asking them to place her

* One thousand three hundred and eighty women of Peoria also prayed that the constitution might not be so amended as to enfranchise women; another evidence of the demoralizing influence of any form of slavery upon the human mind. Had not these women been lacking in a proper self-respect they would not have protested against the right to govern themselves.—[E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

name upon the register as a voter, which they refused to do on the ground that she was a woman, whereupon Mrs. Waite filed a petition in the Supreme Court of Cook county, stating the facts, and praying that the board be compelled by mandamus to place her name upon the register. Chief-Justice Jameson granted an alternative writ, returnable on the following Monday, commanding the board to show cause, if any they have, why Mrs. Waite's name should not be placed upon the register. Judge Charles B. Waite, the husband of the plaintiff, made an exhaustive and unanswerable argument before Judge Jameson, but to no purpose as far as the result of that case was concerned, as the opinion of the court delivered January 12, 1872, which was very lengthy,* denied the relator with costs.

In 1872, Norman T. Gassette, esq., clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook county, and recorder of deeds, remembering the limited number of industrial occupations open to women, and seeing no reason why they could not perform the work of that office, resolved to try the experiment. A room was fitted up for the special use of women, a number of whom gladly accepted the proffered positions and received the same pay per folio as that earned by men. The experiment proved entirely satisfactory, Major Brockway having officially testified in regard to woman's especial fitness for the work.

There was an attempt this year to get a law licensing houses of ill-fame in Chicago, and an immense petition was rolled up and presented to the legislature by ladies who desired to defeat the proposed enactment. They carried their point by as neat a flank movement as Sherman ever executed. A quiet move to Springfield with a petition signed by thousands of the best men and women of the city, and our enemies found themselves checkmated before the game had fairly begun.

February 13, 14, 1872, the State Association held its annual meeting at Bloomington, with large and interested audiences.† March 28 Mrs. Jane Graham Jones secured a hearing before the legislature for Miss Anthony, who made one of her most convincing arguments, and had in her audience nearly every member of that body who voted for what was termed the Alta Hulett bill.

To Myra Bradwell and Alta C. Hulett belongs the credit of a long and persevering struggle to open the legal profession to women. The latter succeeded at last in slipping the bolt which had barred woman from her right to practice law. We take the following statement in regard to Miss Hulett's experience from the "Women of the Century":

At the age of seventeen, Miss Alta Hulett entered the law office of Mr. Lathrop, of Rockford, as a student, and after a few months' study passed the required examination, and sent her credentials to the Supreme Court, which, instead of granting or refusing her plea for admission, ignored it altogether. Myra Bradwell, the successful editor of the *Legal News*, had just been denied admission. Her case, stated in brief,

* Our limited space prevents the publication of Judge Waite's argument and Judge Jameson's decision.

† Jane Graham Jones and Elizabeth Loomis represented the Cook County Association. Delegates from several other districts were present. The speakers were A. J. Grover, Mrs. Jane Graham Jones, Miss Anthony, Mrs. Adelle Hazlett of Michigan, Dr. Ellen B. Furguson of Indiana, Mr. and Mrs. Fell, Mr. and Mrs. Prince.

is this: Mrs. Bradwell made application for a license to practice law. The court refused it on the ground of her being a married woman. She immediately brought a suit to test the legality of this decision. This interesting case was carried to the Supreme Court of the United States, which sustained the decision of the lower courts.* Miss Hulett had reason to expect that since she was unmarried, this decision would not prejudice her case. Just on the threshold of her chosen profession, the rewards of youthful aspirations and earnest study apparently within her grasp, her dismay may be imagined when no response whatever was vouchsafed her petition. A fainter heart would have accepted the situation. To battle successfully with old prejudices, entrenched in the strongholds of the law, required not only marked ability, but also a courage which could not surrender. Miss Hulett took a country school for four months, and bravely went to work again. While teaching and "boarding round," she prepared a lecture, "Justice vs. The Supreme Court," in which she vigorously and eloquently stated her case. This lecture was delivered in Rockford, Freeport, and many other towns, enlisting everywhere sympathy and admiration in her behalf. After taking counsel with Lieutenant-Governor Early and other prominent members of the legislature, she drafted a bill, the provisions of which are:

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois represented in the General Assembly, That no person shall be precluded or debarred from any occupation, profession, or employment (except military), on account of sex. Provided this act shall not be construed to affect the eligibility of any person to an elective office.

Nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring any female to work on streets or roads, or serve on juries. All laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

Friends obtained for this bill a very favorable introduction into the legislature, where it passed and received the Governor's signature. Passing up the steps to her home one rainy day, the telegram announcing that the bill had become a law was placed in her hands, and in referring to the incident, Miss Hulett said: "I shall never again know a moment of such supreme happiness." We can only add in this connection that after a most vigorous examination she stood at the head of a class of twenty-eight, all the other members being gentlemen. This time the Supreme Court made the amende honorable, courteously and cordially welcoming her into the ranks of the profession on her birthday, June 4, 1873, and at the age of nineteen Miss Hulett commenced the practice of law.

But Miss Hulett's career, so full of promise, was soon ended. The announcement of her untimely death, which occurred at San Diego, Cal., March 26, 1877, sent a pang to the hearts of those who knew her personally, and of thousands who regarded her with pride as a representative woman. A Chicago correspondent says:

The daily press of the city have already borne ample testimony to her professional talents and success and to the esteem and admiration accorded her by the bar of Chicago and by the general public; for her somewhat exceptional position as well as her ability had made her one of the marked characters of the city. Her short life, so successful and brilliant to the public eye, was not without its dark and thorny places. Unusual responsibilities of a domestic nature, opposition of various kinds and keen disappointments only nerved her to greater persistency, and her courage was upheld by the generous and abundant recognition which she received on every hand from leading members of the bar—a recognition for which she never failed, when opportunity offered, to express her sense of profound obligation—and she was accustomed to say that the law was the most liberal of the professions. Much as Miss Hulett had accomplished hitherto, it was felt that she had only crossed the threshold of a career of surpassing usefulness; all things seemed possible to one so richly endowed; her mental vigor seemed matched by a *physique*, the apparent type of blooming health; but the seeds of disease were inherited and only awaited a combination of circumstances to as-

* For Mrs. Bradwell's case see Vol. II., page 601.

Digitized by Google

sert their fatal power. Absorbing enthusiasm for her profession, and the cares of a rapidly increasing practice, made her overlook the insidious danger lurking in a cold, and not until her alarmed physician ordered her to the soft climate of Southern California did she comprehend her danger. This peremptory order was a terrible shock, and the forced exile from the field of her hopes and ambitions, more bitter than death. She never rallied, but continued rapidly to fail until the end came. At a meeting of the bar of Chicago, held to take action in commemoration of the death of Miss Alta M. Hulett, attorney-at-law, the following was one of the resolutions adopted:

Resolved, That although the legal profession has hitherto been almost, if not altogether, considered as exclusively for men to practice, yet we freely recognize Miss Hulett's right to adopt it as her pursuit in life, and cheerfully bear testimony to the fact that in her practice she never demeaned herself in any way unbecoming a woman. She was always true to her clients and their interests, but she was equally true to her sex and her duty; and if women who now are, or hereafter shall become, members of our profession shall be equally true, its honor will never be tarnished, nor the respect, good-will and esteem which it is the duty and pride of man to accord to woman be in the least diminished by their membership.

Which, translated, means that men are not only ready to welcome into one of their own professions women having the requisite intellectual qualifications, but that the welcome will be the warmer if the women entering shall not leave behind the more feminine attributes of the sex. Portia did deliver judgment, but the counselor's cap became the pretty locks it could not hide, and the jurist's cloak lent additional grace to the symmetry and litheness of female youth.

M. Fredrica Perry began the study of law in the office of Shipman & Loveridge, Coldwater, Michigan, in the winter of 1870–71. She spent two years in the law-office and then two years in the law-school of Michigan University. On graduating from the law-school in March, 1875, she was admitted to the Michigan bar. She located in Chicago in August, and in September was admitted to the Illinois bar and began practice. A few weeks later she was, on motion of Miss Hulett, admitted to the U. S. Circuit and District Courts for the Northern District of Illinois. She was in partnership with Ellen A. Martin under the name of Perry & Martin. Her death occured June 3, 1883, and was the result of pneumonia. Miss Perry was a successful lawyer and combined in an eminent degree the qualities which distinguish able barristers and jurists; her mind was broad and catholic, clear, quick, logical and profound; her information on legal and general matters was extensive. She was an excellent advocate, a skillful examiner of witnesses, and understood as few do, save practitioners who have grown old in experience, the nice discriminations of common-law pleading and the rules of evidence. She was engrossed in the study and practice of law, and gained steadily in efficiency and power year by year. She had the genius and ability for the highest attainment in all branches of civil practice, and joined with these the power of close application and hard work. She belonged to the Strong family which has furnished a good deal of the legal talent of the United States. Judge Tuley, a chancery judge of Chicago before whom she often appeared, said of her at the bar meeting called to take action upon her death: "I was surprised at the extent of her legal knowledge and the great legal acumen she displayed." And of her manner and method of conducting a certain bitterly-contested case in his court: "I became satisfied that the influence of woman would be highly beneficial in pre-

serving and sustaining that high standard of professional courtesy which should always exist among the members of our profession."——Ellen A. Martin, of Perry & Martin, Chicago, spent two years in a law-office and two years in Michigan University law-school, and was graduated and admitted to practice in Michigan at the same time with Miss Perry. She was admitted in Illinois in January, 1876, and since then to the U. S. Circuit Court.——In the summer of 1879, Mrs. M. B. R. Shay, Streator, graduating from the Bloomington law-school, was admitted to the bar. She has published a book entitled, "Students Guide to Common-Law Pleading."——In 1880, Cora A. Benneson, Quincy, was graduated from the Michigan University law-school and admitted to the Michigan and Illinois bar.——Ada H. Kepley, in practice with her husband at Effingham, was graduated from the Chicago law-school in June, 1870, but was refused admission to the bar. In November of that year, a motion was made in the Court at Effingham that she should be allowed to act as attorney in a case at that bar, and Judge Decius said that though the Supreme Court had refused to license a woman, he yet thought the motion was proper and in accord with the spirit of the age and granted the motion. Mrs. Kepley was finally admitted, January, 1881.——Miss Bessie Bradwell, graduated from the Union College of Law of Chicago and admitted to the bar in 1882, is associated with her parents, Judge and Mrs. Bradwell, on the *Legal News* and in the preparation of Bradwell's Appellate Court Reports.

July 1, 1873, the bill making women eligible as school officers became a law, and in the fall elections of the same year the people gave unmistakable indorsement of the champions of the bill, by electing women as superintendent of schools in ten counties, while in sixteen others women were nominated. Many of these earnest women have been in the service ever since. As the practical results of woman's controlling influence as superintendents of schools seems to epitomize her work in all official positions, we submit a report compiled by Miss Mary Allen West, made at the request of the Illinois Social Science Association, regretting that we have not space for one of the model reports of Miss Sarah Raymond, also for ten years superintendent of the schools of Bloomington:

During the session of 1872–3, Judge Bradwell introduced into the legislature the following bill, which became a law April 3, 1873: "Be it enacted by the people of Illinois, represented in General Assembly, that any woman, married or single, of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, and possessing the qualifications prescribed for men, shall be eligible to any office under the general school laws of this State." A second section provides for her giving bonds.

At the next election, November, 1873, ten ladies were elected to the office of county superintendent of schools for a term of four years. As this term has now expired, it is a favorable time to inquire how women have succeeded in this new line of labor. That the work that devolves upon county superintendents may be understood, I give a part of the synopsis of the duties pertaining to the office, as enumerated by Dr. Newton Bateman:

First—She must carefully inspect and pass upon the bonds of all township treasurers, and upon the securities given in each case, and is personally liable as well upon her official bond for any loss to the school funds sustained through her neglect or careless performance of duty.

Second—She must keep herself fully and carefully informed as to what townships

Digitized by Google

have and what have not complied with the provisions of the law in respect to maintenance of schools; so that no funds may in ignorance be paid to townships having no legal claim to them.

Third—She must collect, transcribe, classify, verify, tabulate, and transmit annually to the State superintendent the school statistics of her county, together with a detailed written report of the condition of the common schools therein.

Fourth—She must arrange, classify, file and preserve all books, papers, bonds, official correspondence and other documents belonging to her office.

Fifth—She must impart instruction and give directions to inexperienced teachers in the science, art and method of teaching, and must be ready, at all times, to counsel, advise and assist the school officers of her county.

Sixth—She must take an active part in the management of County Teachers' Institutes, and labor in every way to improve the quality of teaching in her county.

Seventh—She must hear, examine, and determine all questions and controversies under school law, which may be referred to her, and must carefully prepare, to the best of her knowledge and ability, such replies to all letters from school officers and teachers as each case demands.

Eighth—She must examine all candidates desiring to teach in her county, and grant certificates to such, and such only, as she honestly thinks are of good moral character and sufficient scholastic attainments. As no one can teach in a public school without such certificate, this gives her the veto power over all teachers. Dr. Bateman, commenting on fourteen specifications, of which the foregoing constitute but eight, says these are *some* of the *many* duties made obligatory upon the county superintendent by law. Besides all these, is the visitation of schools, which every true superintendent considers a very important part of the work.

For convenience we will group these duties in three classes: 1. Those concerning finance. 2. Legal duties. 3. Duties to teachers and schools.

I. To give an idea of the financial interests intrusted to the hands of these women, we find by reference to the State superintendent's report for last year that the total receipts for school purposes in these ten counties which they superintend was $1,009,-441. So far as can be learned from the records, not one cent of the large sums over which they had supervision has been lost through their dishonesty, or, what was more to be feared, their ignorance of business. Unlike those of Dora Copperfield, their accounts *will* "add up." In the county (Knox) where the receipts are greatest, aggregating $182,423.22, the greatest difference between receipts and expenditures, as shown by the superintendent's books, is ten cents. In many of these counties the financial affairs were in the greatest confusion when the ladies came into office. In one, perhaps more, the preceding superintendent was a defaulter, in another he was engaged in a law-suit with the county board, and in still others strange irregularities were discovered. In every instance, so far as we can ascertain, these crookednesses have been straightened out, the finances put upon a surer basis, hundreds, we believe thousands, of dollars of bad debts have been collected, treasurers and directors hav-been induced to keep their books with greater care and in better shape, reckless expenditure of school funds has been discouraged, and directors encouraged to expend the money for things which will permanently benefit the schools. So much for finance.

II. *Legal Duties.*—Rightly to discharge the duties imposed by specification 7, the county superintendent needs to be a very good lawyer, for school law in its ramifications reaches many other departments of law. Especially is it inextricably mixed up with election laws, and all know that cases arising under election laws are among the most complex and difficult to handle. Probably a school election never occurrs in which some such cases are not referred to the county superintendent. In the settlement of these and other cases arising under school law, these women have been peculiarly successful, and some of them have earned the blessing bestowed upon the peacemakers. We know of one county where, after last spring's election, five contested cases were referred to the superintendent for settlement; these were all satisfactorily adjusted by her. During her four years' administration, scores of controversies were

Digitized by Google

referred to her, and there has never been a single appeal from her decisions. Another most complicated case involving a defaulting treasurer, was conducted entirely by the county superintendent until it became necessary to employ a lawyer to argue the case in court. What she had done was then submitted to one of the leading lawyers of the State, and he sanctioned and approved each step. Numerous other instances might be cited to show that woman has not failed in the legal part of her work as superintendent of schools.

III. *Her Work with Teachers and Schools.*—Here our superintendents were perfectly at home. Each of the ten had taught successfully for years, and so knew the wants of the school-room. This knowledge was invaluable, both in the examination of teachers and in the supervision of schools. Fears were expressed lest in the examination of candidates, womanly sympathy would lead them to grant certificates to needy applicants who were not altogether qualified. But the motherliness which is in every true woman's heart, warded off this danger. As one remarked, "I have a great deal of the milk of human kindness in my nature, but its streams flow toward the roomful of children to be injured by an incompetent teacher, rather than toward that teacher, however needy he may be. If his claims rest on his needs rather than his merits, let the poormaster attend to his wants, not the superintendent. School money is not a pauper fund." This motherliness comes in good play in school visitation. It draws the children to the superintendent; keeps them from being afraid of her, and hence leads them to work naturally during her visit; thus she can obtain a true idea of the status of the school, and know just how to advise and direct the teacher. The same thing holds true in regard to teachers; the majority of them are ladies, and they will come to a lady for the solution of their doubts and difficulties much more freely than to a gentleman. This gives her better opportunity to "impart instruction and give directions to inexperienced teachers." Woman's power to lift up the teachers under her control to a higher plane, both intellectually and morally, has been signally demonstrated by the experience of the past four years.

In looking after the details of official work, those tiresome minutiæ so often left at "loose ends," producing endless confusion, woman has shown great aptitude. You say, "this is but the clean sweeping of a new broom." May be so, in part; but in part it comes from the womanly instinct to "look well to the ways of her household," whether that household be the occupants of a cottage or the schools of a county. In the work of the State Association of County Superintendents, the ladies have well sustained their part. When placed on the programme, they have come prepared with carefully written papers, showing their desire to give the Association the benefit of their best thoughts, and not put off upon it such crudely digested ideas as may spring up at the moment. At the last meeting at Springfield, four out of the nine superintendents now in office were present, 44 per cent.; out of the 93 gentlemen in the same office, 18 were present, 19 per cent. The ratio of attendance has been about the same for the four years.

How has woman's work as county superintendent impressed other educators? State-Superintendent Etter, who confesses that he was not in favor of the plan, said at the State Teachers' Association, above referred to: "The ladies compare very favorably with their gentlemen co-laborers." Mr. E. L. Wells, for twelve years county superintendent of Ogle county, and thoroughly conversant with the work throughout the State, concurs in this opinion. President Newton Bateman, than whom no man in the State is better fitted to speak on this subject, in his political-economy class in Knox college, took occasion to commend the efficiency of women as county superintendents of our State. A gentleman who travels extensively, and looks into school affairs closely, says he is convinced that in every county where a woman was elected four years ago, the efficiency of the office had been doubled and in some cases increased four or even ten fold. If this be not an exaggeration, an explanation may be found in the fact that in most of these counties the best ladies were put in the place of gentlemen most poorly fitted for the place. The office had become a political foot-ball, kicked about as party exigencies demanded, and often came into possession of political hacks who "must be

Digitized by Google

provided for," and for whom no other place could be found. They had no qualifications for the office, and, of course, could not perform its duties. The people, disgusted, turned to the women for relief, and took good care to elect the ones best fitted to do the work. Had equal care been used in the selection of their predecessors, they might have done equally good work. In quoting opinions, I have purposely confined myself to those given by gentlemen.

The limits of this paper have restricted this discussion to the work of woman as a county superintendent; but in other school offices she is doing efficient work. All over the State we have examples of her efficiency as school director. Miss Sarah E. Raymond, in Bloomington, and Miss Ludlow, in Davenport (by the way, the Iowa State Teachers' Association last year honored itself by electing her president), abundantly proves woman's ability to superintend the schools of large cities. M. A. W.

In *Zion's Herald* 1873, on the origin of the Woman's College in Evanston, Miss Frances E. Willard writes:

In 1866, when we were all tugging away to build Heck Hall for ministers, I heard several thoughtful women say, "We ought to be doing this for our own sex. Men have help from every side, while no one thinks of women." In the summer of 1868 Mrs. Mary F. Haskins, who had been treasurer of the American Methodist Ladies' Centenary Association, which built Heck Hall, raising for the purpose $50,000, invited the ladies of Evanston to her home to talk over the subject of founding a Woman's College, which should secure to young women the highest educational advantages. Mrs. Haskin originated the thought—with her own hands assisted in laying the corner-stone, and in her first address as president she said: "I have often thought that to the successful teacher the words must be full of hope and promise, which a great writer uses of education: 'It is a companion which no misfortune can distress, no crime destroy, no enemy alienate, no despot enslave; at home a friend, abroad an introduction; in solitude a solace, in society an ornament. It chastens vice, it guides virtue, it adds a grace to genius. Without it what is man?'—and I would add with emphasis, Without an education, what is woman?"

This Woman's College at Evanston is the first on record to which a charter, granting full collegiate powers, was ever given by legislative act, including only names of women in its board of trustees. This board, elected Miss Frances E. Willard president, who presided over the institution for two years, during which term a class of young women was graduated, the first in history to whom diplomas were voted and conferred by women. The degree of A. M. was given Mrs. Jennie Fowler Willing, of Chicago, who preached the baccalaureate sermon at the unique commencement exercises. Mrs. Mary F. Haskin, and Mrs. Elizabeth Greenleaf were respectively presidents of the board of trustees.

Later on, as a higher evolution of the central thought, an arrangement was made between the Woman's College and the Northwestern University, by which the former became the woman's department of the latter, on condition that in its board of trustees, faculty of instruction, and all its departments of culture, women should be admitted on an equality with men, as to opportunities, positions and salaries. Miss Willard was then chosen dean of the Woman's College, and professor of æsthetics in the University. Mrs. Emily Huntington Miller was placed on the executive committee of the board, and Mrs. R. F. Queal, Mrs. Jennie Fowler Willing, Mrs. Mary Bannister Willard, and Mrs. L. L. Greenleaf were elected trustees. One year later, Miss Willard entered the temperance work

since which time Miss Ellen M. Soule and Miss Jane Bancroft have successively served in the position of dean.

The young women have led in scholarship, taken prizes in composition and oratory, while upon one occasion the delighted students dragged forth the only artillery in the village to voice their enthusiasm over the fact that to Miss Lizzie R. Hunt had been awarded at the great international contest the first prize for the best English essay.

In 1873, while filling the duties of professor in Wesleyan University, Mrs. Jennie Fowler Willing was licensed as a local preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church, the first woman engaged as evangelist in Illinois.

The Monticello Ladies' Seminary at Godfrey is worthy of mention. Miss Harriet N. Haskell, its president, has done a noble work there in making possible for many girls, by labor under her roof to pay in part for a liberal education. She has been at the head of this institution for thirty years. Mrs. F. A. Shiner at Mt. Carroll, is another grand woman worthy of mention. She, too, gives poor girls an opportunity in her household to pay in part for their education. In this way many are being trained in domestic accomplishments as well as the higher branches of education. There is no distinction made between those who work a certain number of hours each day and those who pay in full for their advantages; and in many cases the best scholars have been found from year to year among those who had the stimulus of labor. As Miss Haskell and Mrs. Shiner have uniformly entertained all the lyceum lecturers* at their beautiful homes, many have had the pleasure of seeing and talking with these bright girls, and the worthy presidents of the institutions.

We believe to Illinois belongs the distinction of being the birthplace of the first woman admitted to the American Medical Association—Dr. Sarah Hackett Stevenson, born at Buffalo Grove, Ogle county. Dr. Stevenson was admitted to this time-honored association June, 1876. The Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* thus refers to the innovation:

The doctors have combined millennial with centennial glories. The largest assemblage of the medical profession ever held in America yesterday honored itself by bursting the bonds of ancient prejudice, and admitting a woman to its membership by a vote that proved the battle won, and that henceforth professional qualification, and not sex, is to be the test of standing in the medical world. Looking over the past fierce resistance by which every advance of woman into the field of medical life was met, yesterday's action seems like the opening of a scientific millennium. It was a most appropriate time and place for the beginning of this new era of medical righteousness and peace. Here, in the centennial year, in the "City of Brotherly Love," where the first organized effort for the medical education of women was made, where the oldest medical college for women in the world is located, and where the fight against woman's entry into the medical profession was most hotly waged, was the place to take the manly new departure, which, so far as the National Association is con-

* Those who have traveled and lectured through the West and spent many rainy Sundays in dreary hotels, know how to appreciate a few days rest in the delightful homes scattered over the country as well as in the towns and cities. How many of these memory recalls in the State of Illinois! What a hospitable reception we had in the cozy farm-house of Mrs. Owen Lovejoy at Princeton, and in the stately residence of Mrs. Noyes Kendall at La Moile, in the home of Judge Lawrence at Galesburg, Mrs. Judge Joslyn at Woodstock, Mrs. R. M. Patrick, Marengo; Mrs. A. W. Brayton, Mt. Morris; Mrs. Eldridge Norwood, Olney; Rev. Dr. Moffatt, Monticello; Col. E. B. Loop, Belvidere; Mrs. Judge Greer, Decatur; Mr. and Mrs. Prince, Bloomington; Col. and Mrs. Latham, Lincoln, and others too numerous to mention in all the Western States.—[S. B. A.

Digitized by Google

cerned, began yesterday in the election of Dr. Sarah Hackett Stevenson as a member in full standing from the State of Illinois.

Dr. Mary H. Thompson, who was graduated at Boston in 1863, and who, removing to Chicago, succeeded in establishing a woman's hospital, is included in a short list of notable alumnæ of the Boston Medical School. Dr. Lelia G. Bedell, Dr. E. G. Cook, Dr. Julia Holmes Smith, Dr. Alice B. Stockham, and many others have won honorable distinction in this profession.

One of the marked crises in the history of the reform we trace was the centennial Fourth of July. The daughters of the Pilgrims realized as never before the cruel injustice by which they were deprived of their birthright, and from the Western prairies and Eastern hills their earnest protest was given to the nation. As early as May 2, 1876, at a special convention of the Illinois Woman Suffrage Association, two vigorous protests were read as the official utterances of State and National Associations. The convention was called to order by Mrs. Alma Van Winkle, who stated that Mrs. Jane Graham Jones,* the beloved and efficient president of the association, having determined upon a European sojourn, had sent her resignation to the executive committee, and that Mrs. Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, recently removed to the State, had been elected to fill her place. This action being ratified, Susan B. Anthony was introduced, and although she had just concluded an intensely vigorous lyceum tour, extending through many months, she spoke with unusual power. Just here I wish to emphasize the great loss to women in the fact that as Miss Anthony's speeches were never written, but came with thrilling effect from her patriotic soul, scarce any record of them remains, other than the intangible memories of her grateful countrywomen. At this convention the following address was read and adopted:

To the Women of the United States of America, greeting:

While the centennial clock is striking the hour of opportunity for the Pilgrims' daughters to prove themselves regenerate children of a worthy ancestry, while the air reverberates to the watchwords of the statesmen of the Revolution, let the daughters of the nation, in clear, steady and womanly voices, chorus through the States: "Taxation without representation is tyranny," and "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Womanly hands, firm, capable and loving, have been steadily, persistently and unceasingly knocking, knocking at the doors of judicial, ecclesiastical and legislative halls, until at last the rusty bars are yielding and the persistent knocking is beginning to tell upon iron nerves and all kinds of masculine constitutions. Just now, in the centennial year, another door has opened, preparing the way for the Pilgrims' daughters to present their claim before the assembled nation on the "Fourth of July, 1876."

A joint resolution of congress, signed by the president of the United States, and made the subject of proclamation by the governor of the State, reads as follows:

* At her beautiful home, 910 Prairie avenue, her social influence was even more than her public work. An unfriendly report in any journal was uniformly followed by an invitation to dinner to the editor or some one of his staff, to meet the lady criticised, or discuss the point of attack. Miss Emily Faithful, Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony and Miss Couzins have all in turn shared these dinners and discussions. If the Methodist Episcopal conference sent an opponent to preach in their church, and a little social attention did not convert him, two persons left the church. Neither Mrs. Jones nor her husband would listen to the Rev. Dr. Hatfield, for Fernando Jones was always as staunch an advocate of the suffrage for women as his wife, and had no faith in a religion that did not teach human equality.—[S. B. A.

Digitized by Google

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, That it be, and is hereby, recommended by the Senate and the House of Representatives to the people of the several States, that they assemble in the several counties and towns on the approaching centennial anniversary of our national independence, and that they cause to have delivered on such day an historical sketch of said county or town from its foundation, and that a copy of said sketch may be filed, in print or manuscript, in the clerk's office of said county, and an additional copy be filed in the office of the librarian of congress at the city of Washington, to the intent that a complete record may thus be obtained of the progress of our institutions during the first centennial of their existence.

The governor of this State earnestly recommends that prompt measures be taken in each county and town for the selection of one or more persons who shall prepare complete, thorough and accurate historical sketches of each county, city, town or village, from the date of the settlement to the present time.

In view of the fact that since our civil war thousands of charitable, scientific, philanthropic, religious and political associations have been organized among women, of which but few accurate records are now accessible to the general public, and in view of the fact that the Supreme Court and many of our legislators construe "persons" to indicate only men (except when persons are to be taxed, fined or executed), we respectfully suggest that in all cases one member of the committee shall be a woman, to the end that there may be submitted to future historians accurate data of the extent and scope of the work of American women; that this historian of woman shall carefully and impartially record the literary, educational, journalistic, industrial, charitable and political work of woman as expressed in temperance, missionary and woman suffrage organization.

Let a meeting of every woman suffrage organization throughout the State, or, where none exists, let any friend of the cause call a meeting, at which a committee shall be appointed to present this suggestion to the people as they may meet in the different cities, villages and towns, to perfect arrangements for their local celebration.

As American citizens we salute the tri-color, emblem of the rights obtained and liberties won by husbands, fathers and sons, meanwhile pledging, if need be, another century of toil and effort to the sacred cause of human rights, and the establishment of a genuine republic.

ELIZABETH BOYNTON HARBERT,
Pres. Ill. Woman Suffrage Society.

It was decided at this convention to celebrate the Fourth of July in some appropriate manner. Under the auspices of Mrs. Harbert this was done at Evanston. The occasion was heralded as "The Woman's Fourth," and programmes* were scattered through the village.

The auditorium of the large Methodist Church was tastefully decorated with exquisite flowers; flags were gracefully festooned about the pulpit, and all the appointments were pronounced artistic by the most critical, and Mrs. Harbert's oration, of which we give a few extracts, aimed to be in keeping with her surroundings:

If possessed of artistic genius, I would seize the pencil and imprison in rich and gorgeous coloring two pictures for the woman's pavilion of our centennial; for the first I would reproduce that prophetically symbolic scene at the dawn of our history, when with a faith and generosity worthy of honorable mention, Isabella of Castile placed her jewels in the almost discouraged mariner's hands, and bade Columbus give to the world Columbia. The second scene would be the antithesis of the first, as to-day, the women of the United States make haste to lay at the feet of our statesmen and

* "*Ducit Amor Patriæ*"; "1876."—Centennial Commemoration, Evanston, Ill. Music, prayer, music; recitation, Miss M. E. Brown; music, "Battle Hymn"; salutatory, "Woman and Philanthropy," Mrs. Elizabeth Boynton Harbert; "Historical Record of the Educational Work of Our Women," Mrs. Mary Bannister Willard; music, "Whittier's Hymn; recitation, Miss M. E. Brown; Missionary Roll of Honor, Miss Jessie Brown; oration, Rev. F. L. Chapell; benediction.

prophets their jewels of thought and influence, bidding them, in the name of woman, give to the world a perfected government, a genuine republic, a purer civilization. Now, as then, there are many ready with mocking jeers; but, turning not to the right nor the left, the faith of woman and the courage of man move on apace to sure success. That historic "first gun" not only jarred loose every rivet in the manacles of 4,000,000 slaves, but when the smoke of the cannonading had lifted, the entire horizon of woman was broadened, illuminated, glorified. On that April day when a nation of citizens were suddenly transformed into an army of warriors, American women, with a patriotism as intense as theirs, a consecration as true, quietly assumed their vacated places and became citizens. Out from market-place and forum, counting-house and farm —keeping time to the chime of the music of the Union—marched father, husband and son; into office, store and farm, called there by no ambitious desire to wander out of their sphere, but by the same dire military necessity that called our men to the front stepped orphaned daughter and widowed wife. Anna Dickinson captured the lyceum and platform. The almost classic scene of "Corinne at the Capitol" is not more remarkable than that historic scene of the Quaker girl at Washington, called there to receive the plaudits of the highest officials of our nation, for services rendered in the then vital political campaigns of New Hampshire, Connecticut, Pennsylvania and New York.

The cruel, scarlet days of war dragged wearily on. Up from the Southern battlefields, borne northward in the lull of the war tempest, came a wailing appeal from "the boys," who hitherto had never appealed to "mother" in vain: "We are wounded, sick and starving." Instantly the mother-heart responded—waiting not for "orders," snapping official red-tape, as though it had been woven of cob-webs, two women started southward with the needed supplies, and this great, anxious, agonized North gave a sob of relief when the message thrilled through the land that Jane C. Hoge and Mary A. Livermore had arrived at the front with the needed supplies. Idle, helpless, dependent queens were not then in demand, but women fitted to be wives of heroes. Because our lake-bordered, tree-fringed village was once her home, I lovingly trace first on Evanston's scroll of honor the name of Jane C. Hoge, while just underneath it I write that of our venerable philanthropist, who was the first woman in these United States to receive the badge of the Christian commission, Mrs. Arza Brown.

And now, standing here upon the border-land of two centuries, over-shadowed by the dear old flag, re-baptized with the blood of my beloved as of yours—standing here, a native-born citizen, as a woman to whom the honor, purity, peace and freedom of native land is dear as life; as a wife vitally interested in the interests of manhood; as a mother responsible for the best development of her children; as a human being, responsible to her Creator for the highest possible usefulness, I claim equality before the law.

Mrs. Mary Bannister Willard gave some surprising facts in regard to woman's work in connection with the North Western University, and reminded us that foremost among the women of the dawning century was Eliza Garret of Chicago, who secured to the Garret Biblical Institute its endowment of a quarter of a million of dollars, with the proviso that a certain increase of income from the same after the wants of the young theologues had been met, should be applied to the erection and endowment of a seminary for young ladies. But alas! the theological appetite has been insatiate, even unto this last, and deliverance has come to our girls from another quarter. And this was the throwing down of university gates and bars, and a free extension of all educational privileges to

women. Upon the roll of honor connected with this work we gratefully place the names of many brave, self-sacrificing women.*

The Rev. Mr. Chappell, pastor of the Baptist church, then gave a most eloquent, liberal oration. In closing, he said: "But what think you, sisters, of the dangers that threaten the republic? Do they lie on your hearts? Are they in your prayers? Do they enter into your plans? All compliments and gallantries aside, it makes a vast difference in the destiny of the republic whether you understand and feel its dangers. The scale has turned. No longer need we dread oppression, disability, power; but on the other hand, license, luxury, listlessness, forgetfulness of God and the wholesome truth. This watch-night of the republic augurs well. This gathering of the sisterhood has its meaning. You are the power behind the throne; with you and with God lies the destiny of the republic." After the benediction the audience dispersed, all expressing of the entire programme the most enthusiastic approval.

About the close of the year 1876, a noticeable change in the direction of thought and effort was very apparent in the State of Illinois. As a result of the ravages of the fire and the severe mental strain to which business men were subjected, women sprang to the rescue, and actively engaged in business. These additional burdens assumed by the many, the few were left to bear the weight of religious, philanthropic and social duties. Women had tested their powers sufficiently to realize their strength, and were impatient for immediate results, hence many of the active friends of woman suffrage, believing that the temperance ballot could be more speedily secured than entire political equality, joined the home-protection movement, while through the broadening and helpful influence of the Grange in the farm-homes of the northwest, requests for aids to organization came from all quarters. In order that the earnest thoughts of the one class and the practical methods of the other, might be rendered mutually beneficial, I one day entered the sanctum of the progressive editor of the *Inter-Ocean*, and asked for a ten-minute audience. The request was granted, and Wm. Penn Nixon, esq., courteously listened to the following questions: "As a progressive journalist, and one who must recognize the philanthropic activity of the women of the Northwest, has it ever occurred to you that there is nowhere in journalism a special recognition of their interests? We have special fashion departments, special cooking departments, but no niche or corner devoted to the moral, industrial, educational, philanthropic and political interests of women; and does not your judgment assure you that such a department could be rendered popular?" As a result of this conversation a special corner of the *Inter-Ocean* was yielded to woman's interests, designated by the editors, "Woman's Kingdom," and on January 6, 1877, the following announcement appeared:

Congratulations to women that we have at last found a home in journalism; that amid the clashing of sabers of our modern press tournament, the knights of the quill

* Mary F. Haskin, Melinda Hamline, Caroline Bishop, Elizabeth M. Greenleaf, Harriet S. Kidder, Mary T. Willard, Mary I. K. Huse, Cornelia Lunt, Harriet N. Noyes, Maria Cook, Margaret P. Evans, Sarah I. Hurd, Annie H. Thornton, Abby L. Brown, and Virginia S. Kent.

Digitized by Google

recognize that women have some rights that journalists are bound to respect. These columns are in the interest of no class, clique, sect, or section, and we earnestly request accurate data of woman's work. All missionary, literary, temperance and woman suffrage organizations, will be accorded space for announcing their aims. With an occasional review of new books, we will confer in regard to what woman has written; wandering through studios and sanctums, we will record what she is painting and preaching. Pleading an intense and loving interest in the splendid opportunities now opening to American women, we shall hope that some truth may be evolved that may enrich their lives.

Notwithstanding this was the first special department of the kind, much of the best journalistic work of the State was being done by women,* who seemed to have received a new baptism to serve the higher interests of humanity. From the desire for coöperation expressed by many contributors to "Woman's Kingdom," the following little item was set afloat in May, 1877:

Many facts recently arresting attention, in connection with the industrial, political, and moral interests of women, seem to render a conference of their representatives in regard to business aims, expedient. There is need of a bureau through which the industrial interests of women can be promoted and some practical answer given to the question everywhere heard, "How can we earn a living?" There is a demand for an educational bureau of correspondence and also a lyceum bureau through whose agency good lectures upon practical subjects can be secured in every city and village. All interested in such a conference are requested to send their names to Mrs. Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Evanston, Ill., or Mrs. Louise Rockwood Wardner, Cairo, Ill.

Hon. Frank Sanborn, in his annual report to the American Social Science Association, mentioned the formation of a branch society † in this State. He said:

Like the State Charities Aid Association of New York, which was organized and is directed by women, the Illinois Association devotes itself chiefly to practical applications of social science, though in a somewhat different direction. It was formed in October, 1877, with a membership of some two hundred women; it publishes a monthly newspaper, *The Illinois Social Science Journal*, full of interesting communications, and it has organized in its first seven months' existence eight smaller associations in other States.

The enthusiasm in this society branching out in so many practical directions, absorbed for a time the energies of the Illinois women. Our membership reached 400. This may account for the apparent lethargy of the Suffrage Association during the years of 1877–78. Caroline F. Corbin

* Prominent among these journalists were Margaret Buchanan Sullivan and Mrs. Annie Kerr of the Chicago *Times*, Mrs. Hubbard of the *Tribune*, Miss Farrand of the *Advance*, Virginia Fitzgerald and Alice Hobbins of the *Inter-Ocean*, Mrs. Myra Bradwell, editor of the *Legal News*, Mrs. Catharine V. Waite and Mrs. DeGeer of the *Crusader*, Mrs. Louisa White of the Moline *Dispatch*, Mrs. C. B. Bostwick of the Mattoon *Gazette*, Mrs. J. Oberly of the Cairo *Bulletin*, Miss Mary West of the Galesburg *Republican*, Mrs. Celia Wooley, Miss Eliza Bowman, Mrs. Clara Lyon Peters of the Watseka *Times*, Jane Grey Swisshelm, Elizabeth Holt Babbitt, and many others.

† The officers of the Illinois Social Science Association were: *President*, Mrs. Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Evanston; *Recording Secretary*, Miss Sarah A. Richards, Chicago; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. W. E. Clifford, Evanston; *Treasurer*, Mrs. H. H. Candee, Cairo; *Directors*, Mrs. Helen M. Beveredge, Evanston; Mrs. Frank Denman, Quincy; Mrs. C. A. Beck, Centralia; Mrs. R. Mc. Loughrey, Joliet; Mrs. W. O. Carpenter, Chicago; Miss M. Fredricka Perry, Chicago; *Vice-Presidents*, First Congressional District, Mrs. Eliza R. Sunderland, Chicago; Second, Mrs. W. D. Babbitt, Chicago; Third, Mrs. Chas. E. Brown, Evanston; Fourth, Mrs. Carrie A. Potter, Rockford; Fifth, Mrs. F. A. W. Shimer, Mt. Carroll; Sixth, Mrs. Sarah C. McIntosh, Joliet; Thirteenth, Mrs. B. M. Prince, Bloomington; Fourteenth, Mrs. C. B. Bostwick, Mattoon; Sixteenth, Mrs. J. W. Seymour, Centralia; Nineteenth, Mrs. J. H. Oberly, Cairo.

dealt an effective blow in her novel, entitled "Rebecca; or, A Woman's Secret." Jane Grey Swisshelm, with trenchant pen, wrote earnest strictures against the shams of society. Elizabeth Holt Babbitt wrote earnestly for all reform movements. Myra Bradwell persistently held up to the view of the legislators of the State the injustice of the laws for woman. Mrs. Julia Mills Dunn and Mrs. Hannah J. Coffee were doing quiet but most effective work in Henry county. Miss Eliza Bowman was consecrating her young womanhood to the care of the Foundlings' Home. Mrs. Wardner, Mrs. Candee, Mrs. George, and other women in the southern part of the State, were founding the library at Cairo, while in every village and hamlet clubs for study or philanthropic work were being organized. Mrs. Kate N. Doggett, as president of the Association for the advancement of Women, was lending her influence to the formation of art clubs. And all this in addition to the vast army of faithful teachers, represented by Sarah B. Raymond, Professor Louisa Allen Gregory and Mary C. Larned. Mrs. Louise Rockwood Wardner, president of the Illinois Industrial School for Girls, and the noble band of women associated with her, were earnestly at work in the endeavor to secure to the vagrant girls of the State an industrial education. Miss Frances E. Willard and the dauntless army of temperance workers were petitioning for the right to vote on all questions pertaining to the liquor traffic.

Meanwhile many of the members of the Illinois Social Science Association were beginning to realize that every measure proposed for progressive action was thwarted because of woman's inability to crystallize her opinions into law. This has been the uniform experience in every department of reform, and sooner or later all thinking women see plainly that the direct influence secured by political power gives weight and dignity to their words and wishes. Mrs. Jane Graham Jones, ex-president of the State Association, continued her effective work in Europe, and, as a delegate from the National Association, prepared the following address of welcome to the International Congress, convened in Paris, July 5, 1878:

Friends, compatriots, and confrères of the International Congress assembled to discuss the rights of women: Allow me to extend to you the congratulations of the National Woman Suffrage Association of America, which I have the honor to represent. I congratulate you upon this important, this sublime moment, this auspicious place for the meeting of a woman's congress. Paris, gorgeous under the grand monarch who surrounded his royal person with a splendid galaxy of beauty, genius, and chivalry; attractive and influential under the great emperor whose meteoric genius held spell-bound the wondering gaze of a world; to-day, with neither king nor court, nor man of destiny, is grander, more gorgeous, more beautiful and more influential than ever before. To-day this is the shrine toward which the pilgrims from every land turn their impatient steps.

Each balmy breeze comes to us heavily laden with the dialects of all nations. Not only are the different parts represented in their economic and industrial products, but each thought, idea, motive and need is brought before the world in the various congresses assembled during this great union festival of liberty, peace and labor. Literature, science, religion, education, philosophy, and labor, each has had its eloquent advocates. At this time, when the great ones of the earth are met together in earnest thought and honest discussion, when each mind and conscience is attuned to the highest motive, how appropriate that woman, whose labor, wealth and brain have cemented

Digitized by Google

the stones in every monument that man has reared to himself; that woman, the oppressed, woman, the hater of wars, the faithful, quiet drudge of the centuries, watching while others slept, working while others plundered and murdered; woman, who has died in prison and on the scaffold for liberty, should here and now have her audience and her advocates.

As a child of America I love and venerate France. We cannot forget LaFayette, although a hundred years have passed since generous France sent him to our aid in our great struggle for freedom. But as a woman I glory in her. [Great and deafening applause.] All true women love and honor France. [At this point the reader was interrupted with wild cries of "Bravo! bravo!" "Live America!" "True, true."] France, in whose prolific soil great and progressive ideas generate and take root, in spite of king, emperor, priest or tyrant; France, the protectress of science, art, and philosophy; France, the home of the scholar and thinker; France, the asylum which generously received the women who came hither seeking those intellectual advantages and privileges cruelly denied them at home; France, that compelled republican America and civilized England to open their educational institutions to women; France, the birth-place of a host of women whose splendid genius, devoted lives, and heroic deaths have encouraged and inspired women of other lands in their struggles to strike off the ignominious shackles which the ages have riveted upon them! [Loud applause.] How apropos it is, then, that the women from all nations meet on the free soil of France to give to the world their declaration of rights. To-day we clasp hands and pledge hearts to the sacred cause of woman's emancipation. To-day we meet to thank France for the grand women whose lofty utterances come echoing and reëchoing to us through the corridors of time, and to thank her for her great men who have been the beacon lights to guide the world to higher civilization and greater hatred of oppression. In the name of my great countrywomen, inaugurators and leaders of the woman's rights movement in America, the eloquent and ardent advocates of liberty for men and women alike, both black and white; in the name of the officers of the National Woman Suffrage Association; in the name of those grand women, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony, I salute the women of France and of the world assembled in this congress, and bid them god-speed. When we call to mind what has been accomplished by noble women everywhere, we are encouraged to renewed effort.

In America we have accomplished wonders, and yet we demand more; and shall continue to demand until we are equal in the state, in the church, and in the home. Twenty years ago woman entered our courts of law only as a criminal to be tried; now she enters as an advocate to plead the cause of justice, and invoke the spirit of mercy. Twenty years ago woman entered the sick room only as the poorly-paid nurse; now she is the trusted medical adviser, friend and counsellor. To-day she is in many respects the peer of man, to-morrow she will be in all respects his acknowledged equal. [Great and continued applause.]

Who can measure the influence this congress may have on woman's advancement toward that perfect equality which justice and humanity demand. Women of France and of the world, be of good cheer, and continue to agitate for the right, for in the elevation of woman lies the progress of the world. [Deafening applause, and cries of hear, hear.]

A letter to the Chicago *Times* commenting upon the above address says:

Mrs. Jones being indisposed, was replaced momentarily by her daughter, a beautiful young lady of about sixteen summers, who read the opening address of her mother; her rich voice pronouncing with such distinctness and beauty, the earnest words, translated into French, won all hearts, and gave to the opening of the congress such a prestige as it would otherwise never have had. After its close, Miss Jones regained her seat amidst the hearty congratulations of the throng assembled in that great hall, and I was proud of our little American. Her beauty and courage, coupled with her extreme youth, were the principal topics discussed during the day by outsiders. I was

thankful that our nation was so well represented at the very first meeting, and the Parisian journals were all loud in their praise of Mrs. Jones' welcoming address, as well as the charming apparition of her young and accomplished daughter.

As indicating the numerous lines along which woman's aroused energies have found expression, we would call attention to the Art Union of central Illinois. It is composed of nine societies, "The Historical," and "The Palladium," of Bloomington; the art class at Decatur; "Art Society," of Lincoln; "Art Association," of Jacksonville; "Art Society," of Peoria; "Art Society," of Springfield, and "Art Club," of Champagne. Mrs. Lavilla Wyatt Latham, wife of Col. Robert G. Latham, of Lincoln, was the originator of the Art Union. Their spacious home, built with large piazzas in true southern style, is a museum of curiosities. Its library, cabinet, pictures, and statuary, make it a most attractive harbor of rest to the wandering band of lecturers, especially as the cultivated host and hostess are in warm sympathy with all reform movements. Mr. Latham was a warm friend of Abraham Lincoln, and entertained him many times under his roof.

The *Woman's Journal* of March 24, 1877, said:

Seventy women of Illinois, appointed by the Woman's State Temperance Union, went to the legislature, bearing a petition signed by 7,000 persons, asking that no licenses to sell liquor be granted, which are not asked for by a majority of the citizens of the place.

Mr. SHERMAN moved a suspension of the rules to admit of the presentation of the petition.

Mr. MERRITT objected, but, by a decided vote, the rules were suspended, and the petition was received and read.

Mr. SHERMAN moved that Mrs. Prof. S. M. D. Fry of Wesleyan University of Bloomington, be invited to address the House upon the subject of the petition.

Mr. HERRINGTON objected to the obtrusion of such trifling matter upon the House, which had business to do. It was well enough to let the petition be received, but he wanted nobody to be allowed to interfere with the business of the House. Referring to some forty or fifty ladies of the Union who had been admitted to the floor of the House, he wanted to know by what authority persons not entitled to the privilege of the floor had been admitted. He insisted on his prerogative as a member, and asked that the floor and lobbies be cleared of all persons not entitled to the privilege of the House.

According to the Chicago *Tribune*, this speech of Herrington created a slight sensation, among the ladies especially, but Mr. Herrington's demand was ignored, and a recess of thirty minutes was taken to allow Mrs. Fry to address the House in support of the petition, which she did in a speech put in very telling phrases. At its conclusion, some of the members opposed to temperance legislation, signalized their ill-breeding, to say the least, by derisive yells for Mr. Herrington and others to answer Mrs. Fry. Presently the hall was resonant with yells and cheers, converting it into a a very babel, and the hubbub was kept up until, at the expiration of the half-hour recess, Speaker Shaw called "order'" and the House immediately adjourned.

If any body of men bearing a petition of 7,000 voting men, had gone to the same legislature, and by courtesy been admitted to speak for their petition, no member would have dared to insult them. It is because they had no recognized political rights that these women were insulted. Claim your right, ladies, to be equal members of the legislature, then you can enact temperance laws, and have an unquestioned right "to the privilege of the floor."

In 1879, under the lead of their president, Frances E. Willard, the women of Illinois rolled up a mammoth petition of 180,000, asking the

Digitized by Google

right to vote on the question of license. This prayer, like that of the 7,000, met the fate of all attempts of disfranchised classes to influence legislation. Following this repulse, in some ten or fifteen of the smaller cities of the State, boards of common council were prevailed upon to pass ordinances giving the women the right to vote on the question. Without an exception, the result was overwhelming majorities for "No License." In the cities where officers were elected at the same time, almost without exception, the majority of them were in favor of license, while in those in which the old board of officers held over, no licenses were granted, until the new board elected only by the votes of the men of the city, was installed. Dr. Alice B. Stockham, in her report at the Washington convention of 1885, said:

After the city ordinance of Keithsburg allowed women to vote, the hardest work was to convert the women themselves. Committees were appointed who visited from house to house to persuade women to go to the polls for the suppression of the rule of liquor. On the morning of election they met in a church for conference and prayer. At 10 o'clock forty brave women marched to the polls and cast their first ballot for home protection. Carriages were running to and fro all day to bring the invalid and the aged. For once they were induced to leave the making of ruffles and crazy quilts, to give their silent voice for the suppression of vice. Three weeks later not a woman could be found in the town opposed to suffrage, and for one year not a glass of liquor could be bought in Keithsburg.

Under the act of 1872, the women of Illinois thought their right to pursue every avocation, except the military, secure. But, in 1880, a judicial decision proved the contrary. We quote from the *National Citizen:*

In June, 1879, the Circuit Court of Union County, Judge John Dougherty presiding, appointed Helen A. Schuchardt, resident of the county, to the office of Master in Chancery. Mrs. Schuchardt gave bond with security approved by the court, taking and subscribing the required oath of office. Since that day, she has been the acting Master of Chancery of that county, taking proofs, making judicial rules, and performing the other various duties incident to such office. At the last term of the court the State attorney, at the instance of Mr. Frank Hall, relator, filed an information in the nature of a *quo warranto* charging that Mrs. Schuchardt had usurped and was unlawfully holding and exercising the office. Mrs. Schuchardt filed pleas setting forth the order of the court appointing her, her bonds with the order of approval, and the oath of office filed by her. To these pleas a general demurrer was interposed and argued.

The questions presented by the demurrer were: *First*—Is the defendant eligible to this office, she being neither a practicing nor a learned lawyer? *Second*—Is the defendant eligible to this office, she being a female? The court dismissed the first question on the ground that the statute does not require admission to the bar as a qualification. Of the eleven Masters in Chancery in that Judicial Circuit, it was shown that only five had been admitted to the bar. As to the second objection, *i. e.*, that Mrs. Schuchardt was a female (!) it was decided that the common law never contemplated the admittance of a woman to the office of Master in Chancery, and that doubtless it was the first instance in which a woman had been admitted to the office. It was also decided that the act of March 22, 1872, did not make women eligible to this office; Master in Chancery—for woman—did not mean "occupation, profession, or employment," and that "persons do not select an office, but are selected for the office."

Judge Harker, in delivering this opinion, said: "It is due to Mrs. Schuchardt to say in conclusion, that while I am constrained to sustain this demurrer and hold that under the law she cannot retain this office, there is not one of the Masters in Chancery in the four counties where I preside, who has been more faithful or attentive in the discharge of his duties, and none who has exhibited higher qualifications to dis-

charge well those duties. And it is my sincere hope that at its next session the legislature will make this office accessible to females."

One of the most influential local associations has been that of Chicago, or Cook county.* From 1870 to 1876 Mrs. Jane Graham Jones was its president, as well as the leading spirit in the State Society.† She was the one to plan and execute the attacks upon the board of education, the common council, and the legislature, holding many meetings in Chicago, and at Springfield, the seat of government. Another flourishing association is that of Moline. We give the following from its secretary:

In May, 1877, Mrs. Eunice G. Sayles, and Mrs. Julia Mills Dunn, secured Mrs. Stanton to give a lecture on woman suffrage in Moline, and at a reception given to her by Mrs. Sayles, a society with 22 members was organized, which has held meetings regularly since that time, with the reading of papers on topics previously arranged by the president. It is a matter of pride that not a failure has ever occurred, each member always cheerfully performing the duty assigned her. An evening reception is held annually to celebrate the organization of the society, to which two hundred or more guests are invited, each member being entitled to bring several outside of her own family. The meetings have been valuable, not only in promoting friendly relations between the members, but also in the mental stimulus thev have afforded. Much of the success of this society is due to the literary culture and earnestness of Mrs. Anne M. J. Dow, who was our president for three years. We have sustained a great loss in the death of Mrs. Sarah D. Nourse, who for thirty-five years was an earnest friend of all reforms.

Soon after its organization, our society became auxiliary to the National Association. We have circulated petitions and forwarded them to Springfield and Washington, where they have met the fate common to all prayers of the disfranchised; we have circulated tracts, placed on file in the public reading room all the suffrage journals, and secured the best lecturers on the question. We are organizing an afternoon reading society, to have read aloud "The History of Woman Suffrage," and shall soon place it on the shelves of the public library of the village. While we cannot point to any wonderful revolution in public sentiment because of our work, we are nevertheless full of courage, and under the leadership of our State president, Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, we shall go forward in faith and good works, hoping for the end of woman's political slavery.‡

In concluding this meager record of the methods of earnest men and women of Illinois in their brave work for liberty, we are painfully con-

---

* *President.* Mrs. Fernando Jones; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. Robert Collyer, Mrs. Richard Somers, Rev. C. D. Helmer; *Corresponding-Secretary*, Mrs. C. B. Waite; *Recording-Secretary*, Mrs. S. H. Pierce; *Treasurer*, Mrs. J. W. Loomis; *Executive Committee*, Mrs. Rebecca Mott, Mrs. H. W. Fuller, Mrs. Dr. C. D. R. Lovanway, Fernando Jones, Miss Thayer, Rev. J. M. Reid, Mrs. Jno. Jones, Mrs. Wm. Coker, Dr. S. C. Blake.

† The officers of the Illinois State Association are now, 1885; *President*, Mrs. Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Evanston; *Vice-President-at-large*, Mrs. M. E. Holmes, Galva; *Secretary*, Rev. Florence Kollock, Englewood; *Treasurer*, Dr. L. C. Bedell, 354 N. La Salle street, Chicago; *Executive Committee*, Hon. M. B. Castle, Sandwich: Mrs. E. J. Loomis, 2,939 Wabash avenue, Chicago; Mrs. Clara L. Peters, Watseka; Mrs. L. R. Wardner, Anna; Mrs. Julia Mills Dunn, Moline; Mrs. Helen E. Starrett, Lake Side Building, Chicago; Capt. W. S. Harbert, Evanston; Rev. C. C. Harrah, Galva.

‡ From time to time we have had for president, Mrs. Eunice G. Sayles, Mrs. Anna M. J. Dow, Mrs. Flora N. Candee, Mrs. Julia Mills Dunn, Mrs. Nettie H. Wheelock; for secretaries, Mrs. C. W. Heald, Mrs. Lucy Anderson, Mrs. Kate Anderson; among those who have been active members of the society from its formation are, Harriet B. G. Lester, Ida Peyton, L. F. M'Clennan, Catharine H. Calkins, Dr. Jane H. Miller, Margaret Osborne, Harriet M. Gillette, Laoti Gates, Mary F. Barnes, Mary Wright, M. M. Hubbard, Emma Jones, Mary A. Stewart, Kate S. Holt, Mary A. Stephens, Abbie A. Gould, Mrs. M'Cord, Lydia Wheelock, Mrs. E. P. Reynolds, J. A. Tallman, Ann Eliza Reator, Dr. S. E. Bailey, Dr. E. A. Taylor, Lucy Ainsworth, Jerome B. Wheelock, M. A. Young, Mary Knowles, M. E. Abbot, Lois Forward, Mrs. Young.

Digitized by Google

scious of a vast aggregate of personal toil and self sacrifice which can never be reported. We write of petitions presented to State and National legislative assemblies, but it is impossible to record the personal sacrifice and moral heroism of the women who went from house to house in the cities and villages, or traveled long distances across the broad prairies to secure the signatures. Only those who have carried a petition from door to door can know the fatigue and humiliation of spirit it involves. Though these earnest women ask only the influence of the names of persons to help on our reform, they are often treated with less courtesy than the dreaded book-agent and peddler.

WATSEKA, Ill.

I send you petitions, the one circulated by me has 270 names—the other by Clara L. Peters, 139.* We are interested heart and soul in the movement, and our efforts here have made many friends for the cause. Have been an ardent worker since I was a child, and well remember that grand hero of moral reforms, Samuel J. May of Syracuse, N. Y., at a Woman's Temperance Convention held in Rochester in 1852, when I was eight years old. VIOLA HAWKS ARCHIBALD.†

The following letter from Mary L. Davis, gives some idea of the toils of circulating petitions:

DAVIS, Stephenson Co., Ill., May 28, 1877.

EDITOR *Ballot-Box*:—The question of suffrage for woman has been thoroughly discussed in our society, and last week I started out with my petition. I could work but a short time each day, but I systematically canvassed our beautiful little village, taking it by streets, and although I have been over but a small portion, I have ninety signatures. I met with but little opposition, and with kind wishes in abundance; with some amusing, some provoking, some pathetic, and some disgusting phases of human nature—with very agreeable disappointments, and very disagreeable ones. Very often some person would say to me, there is no use in calling at such a house; the man will not, and the woman dare not, sign. I went to such a place last week, was met with all the courtesy one could ask. The man looked over the petition thoughtfully, affixed his own name, and asked his wife if she did not wish to do so, and called in a beautiful sister who was out playing ball with the children, telling her as it was for the especial benefit of women, she ought to sign it too. I write these things to encourage our young girls, who will take up the work. Take every house, ask every person; "No," will not hurt or kill you. Be prepared to meet every argument that can possibly be advanced. The one which I meet oftenest, is that woman cannot fight, and therefore she shall not vote; and strange to relate, it is almost always advanced by a person who was never a soldier, through physical disability, cowardice, or over or under age.

The shortest "No," without the slightest shadow of courtesy, was shot from the lips of a man who is doing business on capital furnished by his wife, and who lives in a house purchased with his wife's money. Graceful return for her devotion, wasn't it? I suppose he prefers to keep her in her present state of serfdom, as, if she should ever

* Mrs. Clara Lyon Peters of Watseka, furnished the largest petition ever sent from Illinois; W. B. Wright of Greenview, Mrs. S. Eliza Lyon of Toulon, Mrs. Hannah J. Coffee of Orion, Mrs. Eva Edwards of Plymouth, Mrs. C. E. Larned of Champaign, Mrs. Barbara M. Prince of Bloomington, Mrs. F. B. Rowe of Freedom, Mrs. Jane Barnett, Mrs. E. H. Blacfan, and Mrs. E. T. Lippincott of Orion, Mrs. Julia Dunn of Moline, Mrs. Clara P. Bourland of Peoria, Sybilla Leek Browne of Odell, Mrs. Jacob Martin, Cairo, Mary E. Higbee, Kirkland Grove, Mary Thompson, LaSalle, Emily Z. Hall of Savoy, Elizabeth J. Loomis of Chicago, have all done worthy work in circulating petitions, both to congress and the State legislature.

† Mrs. Archibald is the daughter of Betsey Hawks, of Genesee county, N. Y. I well remember the brave-hearted mother in the early days of the movement, when in 1852 I made my first stammering speech in the town-hall at Batavia. She arranged the meeting, and entertained the speakers, and was indeed "the cause" in that conservative village.—[S. B. A.

find out that she was of any importance in the world, except as his housekeeper, cook, washerwoman, and waiter-in-general, she might possibly inquire into the stewardship of her lord and master. And it seemed to me if that ever came to pass, a man who could say "no" so cavelierly, without even a "thank you, ma'am," or, "you're quite welcome," both could and would manage to make surroundings rather disagreeeble to the party of the second part. So far no person who has thought much, read much, or suffered much, has refused to sign, and in the few hours which I have devoted to the work, three grandmothers nearly ninety years of age, wished to have their names recorded on the right side of the question, and in two of those instances the grandmother, daughter, and grandfather affixed their signatures, one after another.*

We have been permitted to copy the following private letter from A. J. Grover to Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who is now at her home in Tenafly, N. J., busily at work with Miss Anthony and Mrs. Gage on the second volume of the "History of Woman Suffrage." The first volume should be on the center-table of every family in the land as a complete text-book on the woman suffrage question, which is to be one of the great issues, social and political, in the coming years. These three women have grown old and won their crowns of white hair in the cause of not only their sex, but of mankind:

CHICAGO, November 29, 1881.

MY DEAR FRIEND: You represent a movement of more importance to mankind than any that ever before claimed attention in the whole history of the race, viz.: the freedom of one-half of it. You have enforced this claim by half a century of heroic discussion—of persistent, unanswerable logic and appeal against the theory and practice of all nations, against all governments, codes and creeds. You proclaimed fifty years ago the novel doctrine that woman by nature is, and by law and usage should be, the absolute equal of man. A claim so self-evident should only have to be stated to be recognized by all civilized nations; and yet to this hour the highest civilization, equally with the lowest, is built on the slavery of woman. In the darkest corners of the earth and on the sunlit heights of civilization, the mothers of the race are by law, religion and custom doomed to degradation. And if the seal of their bondage is never to be broken, they themselves as well as the lords and masters they serve, are equally unconscious of the servitude. No religion, no civil government, has ever taught or recognized any other condition for woman than that of subjection. Against the accumulated precedents of all the ages, you and your noble coädjutors have rebelled in the face of derision for fifty long, weary years. Was ever such sublime womanly heroism and self-sacrifice before known? Was ever such worth of culture, such wealth of womanhood, laid on the altar of country and humanity? And all this comparatively unrecognized and unrewarded. Where is the boasted chivalry of the English-speaking nations? It is a virtue we boast of, but do not possess. It never, in fact, had any real existence based on genuine respect for woman. It is a bitter sarcasm in the mouth of an American male citizen. A few men like Theodore Parker, Joshua R. Giddings, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, Gerrit Smith, Samuel J. May and Parker Pillsbury have measurably redeemed this nation, recognizing your claim for woman as self-evidently just and righteous, and coöperating with you in maintaining it. There are only a score or two of such men in a generation with sufficient chivalry or perception of justice to publicly claim for women the rights they themselves possess.

* When at Durand, near Davis, in 1877, Mrs. Davis and her husband drove over, and at the close of my lecture, she gave me her maiden name and said, "Do you not remember me? I sat by your side and fairly pushed you up in that teachers' convention at Rochester, in 1853, when you made that first speech you told about; and I have been most earnestly hoping and working for the enfranchisement of women ever since."—[S. B. A.

Digitized by Google

Elizabeth Boynton Harbert.

Digitized by Google

Science has demonstrated that men to be manly must be well born, must have noble mothers. How can a mother give birth to a noble soul while herself a slave? How can she impart a free spirit when her own is servile? A stream cannot rise higher than its fountain.

We have thought to bring about a high order of civilization by freeing our sons, while chaining our daughters, by sending sons to college and daughters to menial service for a mere pittance as wages, or selling them in marriage to the highest bidder—by robbing them on the very threshold of life of all noble ambition. By the degradation of our women we take from the inherited qualities of the race as much as is added by culture. We take from the metal before casting as much as we restore by polish afterwards, and thus we curse and stultify both sexes.

The law and religion of man can be no better than man himself. If religion, law, justice and social order are to improve, man must first be improved. Religion and law are effects, not causes. They are fruits, not the tree—the products of the human mind. If these are to be improved, mankind must first be improved. This will be impossible until freedom and culture shall become the inalienable rights of woman. It would be a thousand times better, if either must be a slave to the other, that man should be a slave to woman. The History of Woman Suffrage, on which you are engaged, if the second volume shall prove equal to the first, will be the richest legacy this age will bequeath to the future. It is a revelation from God, in which, if men believe, they shall be saved. Religion itself, without this great salvation, will continue to remain little else than "a wretched record of inspired crime" against woman. Woman must be free! Protection as an underling from man, savage or civilized, she in reality never had and never will have. Protection she does not want. What she needs is equal rights, when she can protect herself—rights of person, rights of labor, rights of property, rights of culture, rights of leisure, rights to participate in the making and administering of the laws. Give her equality in exchange for protection; give her her earnings in exchange for support; give her justice in exchange for charity. Let man trust woman as woman trusts man, with entire liberty of action, and she will show the world that liberty is her highest good.

In conclusion, let me confess that I read your first volume with a feeling of inexpressible shame and mortification for my sex. Yours faithfully,

A. J. GROVER.

Mrs. Boynton Harbert, to whom we are indebted for this chapter, has from girlhood been an enthusiastic advocate of the rights of women. Growing up in Crawfordsville, Indiana, under the very shadow of a collegiate institution into which girls were not permitted to enter, she early learned the humiliation of sex. After vain attempts to slip the bolts riveted with precedent and prejudice that barred the daughters of the State outside, she tried with pen and voice to rouse those whose stronger hands could open wide the doors to the justice of her appeals. Her youthful peäns to liberty in prose and verse early found their way into our Eastern journals, and later in arguments before conventions and legislative assemblies in Illinois, Iowa and other Western States. As editor for seven years of the "Woman's Kingdom" in the Chicago *Inter-Ocean*—one of the most popular journals in the nation—she has exerted a widespread influence over the lives of women, bringing new hope and am-

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R

bition into many prairie homes. As editor-in-chief of the *New Era*, in which she is free to utter her deepest convictions; as wife and mother, with life's multiplied experiences, a wider outlook now opens before her, with added wisdom for the responsibilities involved in public life. In all her endeavors she has been nobly sustained by her husband, Mr. William Harbert, a successful lawyer, many years in practice in Chicago, whose clear judgment and generous sympathies have made his services invaluable in the reform movements of the day.

CHAPTER XLIV.

MISSOURI.

Missouri the First State to Open Colleges of Law and Medicine to Woman—Liberal Legislation—Eight Causes for Divorce—Harriet Hosmer—Wayman Crow—Works of Art—Women in the War—Adeline Couzins—Virginia L. Minor—Petitions—Woman Suffrage Association, May 8, 1867—First Woman Suffrage Convention, Oct. 6, 1869—Able Resolutions by Francis Minor—Action Asked for in the Methodist Church—Constitutional Convention—Mrs. Hazard's Report—National Suffrage Association, 1879—Virginia L. Minor Before the Committee on Constitutional Amendments—Mrs. Minor Tries to Vote—Her Case in the Supreme Court—Miss Phœbe Couzins Graduated from the Law School, 1871—Reception by Members of the Bar—Speeches—Dr. Walker—Judge Krum—Hon. Albert Todd—Ex-Governor E. O. Stanard—Ex-Senator Henderson—Judge Reber—George M. Stewart—Mrs. Minor—Miss Couzins—Mrs. Annie R. Irvine—"Oregon Woman's Union."

IT has often been a subject for speculation why it was that a slave State like Missouri should have been the first to open her medical and law schools to women, and why the suffrage movement from the beginning should there have enlisted so large a number of men* and women of wealth and position, who promptly took an active interest in the inauguration of the work. A little research into history shows that there must have been some liberal statesmen, some men endowed with wisdom and a sense of justice, who influenced the early legislation in Missouri.

By the constitution, imprisonment for debt is forbidden, except for fines and penalties imposed for violation of law. A homestead not exceeding $3,000 in value in cities of 40,000 inhabitants or more, and not exceeding $1,500 in smaller cities and in the country, is exempt from levy on execution. The real estate of a married woman is not liable for the debts of her husband. There

* Among them were Isaac H. Sturgeon, Francis Minor, James E. Yeatman, Judge John M. Krum, Judge Arnold Krekel, Hon. Thomas Noël, Ernest Decker, Dr. G. A. Walker, John E. Orrick, J. B. Roberts, Rev. G. W. Eliot, Bishop Bowman, Albert Todd, Rev. John Snyder, John Datro, J. B. Case, H. E. Merille, Mrs. Virginia L. Minor, Mrs. Rebecca N. Hazard, Mrs. Adeline Couzins, Miss Phœbe Couzins, Mrs. Beverly Allen, Miss Mary Beedy, Miss Arathusa Forbes, Mrs. Isaac Sturgeon, Mrs. Hall, and many others.

are eight causes for divorce, so many doors of escape for unfortunate wives from the bondage of a joyless union.

The memory of the unjust treatment of Miss Hosmer will always be a reproach to Massachusetts. That she enjoyed the privileges of education in Missouri denied her in Massachusetts was due in no small measure to the generosity and public spirit of Wayman Crow. Speaking of the gifted sculptor, a correspondent says:

Harriet Hosmer was born in 1830. She studied sculpture in the studio of Mr. Stephenson, in Boston, and also with her father. In 1830, after being denied admission to anatomical lectures in Harvard and many other colleges at the East, she went to St. Louis, where, through the spirited determination of Wayman Crow, a most liberal benefactor of Washington University, she was admitted to the Missouri Medical College through the kindness and courtesy of Dr. Joseph N. McDowell, its founder and head. Here for a whole winter she pursued her studies under the instruction of Dr. McDowell and Dr. Louis T. Pim, the able demonstrator of anatomy of the college, who gave her the benefit of their constant and unremitting aid; also Dr. B. Gratz Moses and Dr. J. B. Johnson were particularly kind in inviting her to be present when important cases were before them. The names of these men are gratefully mentioned, now that the doors of hundreds of colleges have opened to women. While in St. Louis Miss Hosmer had a constant companion and friend in Miss Jane Peck, a lady well known in society circles, and together they daily attended at the college; indeed, Miss Peck informed the writer, that on no occasion did Miss Hosmer go to the college without her. So quietly was this done, it was not until the month of February that the students became aware of their attending, and when informed of it the entire class, numbering about one hundred and thirty, gave them a most cordial and hearty endorsement, and from that time on until the day of graduation they were treated by the young gentlemen with marked attention. The students were not aware of their attending in the earlier part of the course, because it had been the custom for the ladies to attend in the amphitheater after the class had left to go to the various hospitals. On one occasion while on their way to the college, a number of the students being behind them, they heard the gentlemen say to some men they met, "These ladies are under our charge, and if you offer them an insult we will shoot you down." They did not hear the language of the men, only the reply of the students. At the close of the session the students gave a ball and not only were Miss Hosmer and Miss Peck invited, but a carriage was specially sent to take them to it.

In March, 1869, Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony again visited St. Louis. In a letter to *The Revolution* the former said:

We went to the Mercantile Library to see Miss Hosmer's works of art, and there read the following letter to Wayman Crow, who had been a generous friend to her through all those early days of trial and disap-

pointment. One of the best of her productions is an admirable bust of her noble benefactor:

BOSTON, October 18, 1857.

DEAR MR. CROW: Will you allow me to convey through you to the Mercantile Library Association "The Beatrice Cenci." This statue is in execution of a commission I received three years ago from a friend who requested me not only to make a piece of statuary for that institution, but to present it in my own name. I have finished the work, but cannot offer it as my own gift—but of one who, with a most liberal hand, has largely ministered to the growth of the arts and sciences in your beautiful city. For your sake, and for mine, I would have made a better statue if I could. The will was not wanting, but the power—but such as it is, I rejoice sincerely that it is destined for St. Louis, a city I love, not only because it was there I first began my studies, but because of the many generous and indulgent friends who dwell therein—of whom I number you most generous and indulgent of all, whose increasing kindness I can only repay by striving to become more and more worthy of all your friendship and confidence, and so I am ever affectionately and gratefully yours,

Wayman Crow, Esq. H. G. HOSMER.

The very active part that the women of Missouri had taken in the civil war, in the hospitals and sanitary department, had aroused their enthusiasm in the preservation of the Union and their sense of responsibility in national affairs. The great mass-meetings of the Loyal Women's Leagues, too, did an immense educational work in broadening their sympathies and the horizon of their sphere of action. So wholly absorbed had they been in the intense excitement of that period, that when peace came their hands and hearts, unoccupied, naturally turned to new fields of achievement. While in some States it was the temperance question, in St. Louis it was specifically woman suffrage.

We are indebted for the main facts of this chapter to Mr. Francis Minor, Mrs. Rebecca N. Hazard, Miss Couzins and Miss Arathusa Forbes, who have kindly sent us what information they had or could hastily glean from the journals of the time or the imperfect records of the association.

The labors of Mrs. Minor and Mrs. Couzins were exceptionally protracted and severe. The latter offered her services as nurse at the very opening of the war. The letters received from men in authority show how highly their services were appreciated. Dr. Pope who writes the following, was the leading surgeon in St. Louis:

ST. LOUIS, April 26, 1861.

Mrs. J. E. D. COUZINS—*Dear Madam:* Your note in which, in case of collision here, you generously offer your services in the capacity of nurse, is just received. Should so dire a calamity befall us (which God forbid), I shall, in case of need, most assuredly remember your noble offer. With high regard and sincere thanks, I am,

Yours very truly, CHAS. A. POPE.

HEADQUARTERS 2D BRIG., MO. VOL., ST. LOUIS, MO., Aug. 23, 1861.

Mrs. J. E. D. COUZINS, *present—Madam:* I received your kind letter, dated Aug. 17. Accept my heartfelt thanks for your generous offer. I regard the nursing of our wounded soldiers by the tender hands of patriotic ladies as a most effectual means

of easing their condition and encouraging them to new efforts in defense of our glorious cause. You will please confer with Mrs. von Wackerbarth, corner Seventh and Elm streets, in regard to the steps to be taken in this matter.

Your obedient servant, . F. SIGEL, *Brig.-Gen. Com.*

HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE MISSOURI, February 18th, 1862.

The commanding officers at Cairo, Paducah, or vicinity, are hereby requested to grant any facilities consistent with the public interests that may be desired by the bearers of this note. They are Mrs. Couzins and Crawshaw, of the Ladies' Union Aid Society, who wish to administer relief to our sick and wounded. By order of

J. T. PRICE, *A. D. C.* Maj.-Gen'l HALLECK.

ROOMS WESTERN SANITARY COMMISSION, ST. LOUIS, Oct. 6th, 1862.

MY DEAR MRS. COUZINS: The surgeon-general has notified me that he may want me to send nurses and surgeons to Columbus and Corinth. I look to you, my dear madam, as one ever ready to volunteer when you can be of real service. In case it should become necessary, may I rely on your valuable services? Such other names as you may suggest I would be pleased to have. Very respectfully,

JAS. E. YEATMAN.

OFFICE OF WESTERN SANITARY COMMISSION,
SAINT LOUIS, MO., Oct. 8th, 1862.

Mrs. Couzins has been detailed to service in the hospital steamer T. L. McGill, as volunteer nurse.

N. B.—If the place of service is changed, a new certificate will be issued.

JAMES E. YEATMAN, *President of Sanitary Commission.*

CORINTH, Oct. 13, 1862.

Pass Mrs. Couzins from Corinth to Columbus.

W. S. ROSECRANZ, *Maj.-Gen'l U. S. A.*

HEADQUARTERS DEP'T OF THE TENNESSEE,
BEFORE VICKSBURG, Feb'y 21st, 1863.

The quartermaster in charge of transportation at Memphis, Tenn., will furnish transportation on any chartered steamer plying between Memphis, Tenn., and St. Louis, to Mrs. Couzins and five other ladies, members of the Western Sanitary Commission, and who have been with this fleet distributing sanitary goods for the benefit of sick soldiers. U. S. GRANT, *Maj.-Gen. Com.*

Capt. J. B. LEWIS, *A. Q. M. and Master of Transportation*, Memphis, Tenn.

While Mrs. Couzins thus gave herself to mitigating the sufferings of the "boys in blue," in camp and hospital, Mrs. Minor was no less active and energetic in the equally important department of preserving supplies for the sanitary commission. Although Mrs. Minor resided too far from the city to attend the evening meetings, and her name does not appear in the accounts of such gatherings, she was one of the first members of the Ladies' Union Aid Society of St. Louis, and took part in the meeting of loyal women called and presided over by Gen. Curtis. Having an orchard and dairy on her place, she furnished the hospital with milk and fruit, and for more than two years, sent a supply every day to the soldiers in camp at Benton barracks. When the news came that the army around Vicksburg was suffering with scurvy, she took her carriage and drove through the country soliciting fruit, and in one week she canned with her own hands, a wagon-load of cherries, the sanitary commission finding the cans and sugar, and from time to time she continued the work until the end of the war. When the great fair was held under the auspices of the Western Sanitary Commission, she was a member of

the floral department, and worked with her accustomed energy. The sanitary commission, feeling that she had done so much, wrote her a letter of thanks, and enclosed her a check for a liberal amount; but she returned the check, saying that hers was a work of love, and not for money. Although the official letter of the commission thanking Mrs. Minor for her most valuable services, is lost, the following to Mr. Minor may fairly be considered as including her also:

ROOMS WESTERN SANITARY COMMISSION, St. Louis, Oct. 7, 1863.

FRANCIS MINOR, Esq.—*My Dear Sir:* I am directed by our board to return you their thanks in behalf of the soldiers in the hospitals, for your long-continued remembrance of them, and for the daily supply of fresh fruits, vegetables and milk, which you have furnished for the sick, now more than two years. Your garner and sympathy have been like the widow's cruse, and may they ever continue to be so. What you have done has been in the most quiet and unobtrusive way. The sick soldier has had no more constant, uniform and untiring friend, and it is with pleasure that I convey the thanks of the board, both to yourself and wife, who have been as indefatigable at home in preparing canned fruits and other delicacies for the sick soldiers in the field, as you have been in providing for those in the hospitals. With grateful feelings and many thanks and best wishes, I remain, Very respectfully yours,

JAMES E. YEATMAN,
President Western Sanitary Commission.

The submission of a constitutional amendment in Kansas, and the preparations for a thorough canvass of that State, had its influence in heightening the enthusiasm and increasing the agitation in Missouri, as most of the speakers going to Kansas held meetings at various points. Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony stopped at St. Louis both going and returning, held large meetings in Library Hall, and had a pleasant reception in the parlors of the Southern Hotel, where many warm friendships that have lasted ever since, were formed.

The subject of woman's enfranchisement had doubtless often occurred to the thoughtful men and women of Missouri, long before the movement in its behalf assumed anything like a practical shape. The manifest absurdity and injustice of declaring, as the constitution of the State did, "that all political power is vested in, and derived from the people; that all government of right originates from the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole," and at the same time, denying to one-half of the people any voice whatever in framing their government or making their laws, could not fail to strike the attention of any one who gave the subject the slightest consideration. But no attempt was made towards an organization in behalf of woman suffrage until the winter of 1866-7; and the movement then had its origin from the following circumstance: During the debate in the Senate of the United States, on the district suffrage bill, December 12, 1866, Senator Brown, of Missouri, in the course of his remarks said:

I have to say then, sir, here on the floor of the American Senate, I stand for universal suffrage, and as a matter of fundamental principle do not recognize the right of society to limit it on any ground of race, color, or sex. I will go further, and say that I recognize the right of franchise as being intrinsically a natural right; and I do not believe that society is authorized to impose any limitation upon it that does not spring out of the necessities of the social state itself.

When Mrs. Francis Minor, of St. Louis, who had given the subject much thought, read the report of Senator Brown's speech, she considered that it was due to him from the women of the State that he should receive a letter of thanks for his bold and out-spoken utterances in their behalf. She accordingly wrote him such a letter, obtaining to it all the signatures she could, and it was presented to Senator Brown on his return home. But although first an advocate of the measure, he soon recanted, and gave his influence against it.

It was next determined to petition the legislature of the State then in session, January, 1867, to propose an amendment to the constitution, striking out the word "male," in the article on suffrage. Such a petition was presented, and attracted much attention, as it was the first instance of the kind in the history of the State. This move was followed by a formal organization of the friends of the cause, and on May 8, 1867, the "Missouri Woman Suffrage Association" was organized, and officers elected.*

We find the following letter from Mr. Minor in *The Revolution* of January 22, 1868:

Editors of The Revolution: In order to show the steady progress that the grand idea of equal rights is slowly but surely making among the people of these United States, I think it would be well, in the beginning, at least, to make a record in *The Revolution* of the fact of each successive State organization; and for that purpose I send you the list of officers for the association in Missouri not yet a year old; as also their petition to the legislature for a change in the organic law, and a brief address to the voters of the State, in support of the movement:

To the Voters of Missouri:

The women of this State, having organized for the purpose of agitating their claims to the ballot, it becomes every intelligent and reflecting mind to consider the question fairly and dispassionately. If it has merits, it will eventually succeed; if not, it will fail. I am of the number of those who believe that claim to be just and right, for the following, among other reasons:

Taxation and Representation should go hand in hand. This is the very corner-stone of our government. Its founders declared, and the declaration cannot be too often repeated, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure those rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." The man who believes in that declaration, cannot justly deny to women the right of suffrage. They are citizens, they are tax-payers; they bear the burdens of government—why should they be denied the rights of citizens? We boast about liberty and equality before the law, when the truth is, our government is controlled by one-half only of the population. The others have no more voice in the making of their laws, or the selection of their rulers, than the criminals who are in our penitentiaries; nay, in one respect, their condition is not as good as that of the felon, for he may be pardoned and restored to a right which woman can never obtain. And this, not because she has committed any crime, or violated any law, but simply because she is, what God made her—a woman! Possessed of the same intelligence—

* *President*, Mrs. Virginia L. Minor; *Vice-President*, Mrs. Beverly Allen; *Secretaries*, Mrs. Rebecca N. Hazard, and Mrs. George D. Hall; *Treasurer*, Mrs. George W. Banker. There were present, besides the officers, Mrs. Anna L. Clapp, Miss Penelope Allen, Mrs. Frank Fletcher, Miss Arathusia L. Forbes, Mrs. Nannie C. Sturgeon, Mrs. Harriet B. Roberts, Mrs. N. Stevens, Mrs. Joseph Hodgman, Miss A. Greenman, etc. Among the men who aided the movement were Francis Minor, Isaac W. Sturgeon, James E. Yeatman, Judge John M. Krum, Judge Arnold Krekel, Hon. Thomas Noël, who gave the society its first twenty-five dollars, Ernest Decker, Dr. G. A. Walker, John C. O'Neill, J. B. Roberts, Wayman Crow, Rev. Dr. Wm. G. Eliot, Bishop Bowman, Albert Todd, Rev. John Snyder, John Datro, J. B. Case, H. C. Leville.

formed in the same mold—having the same attributes, parts and passions—held by her Maker to the same measure of responsibility here and hereafter, her actual position in society to-day is that of an inferior. No matter what her qualifications may be, every avenue of success is virtually closed against her. Even when she succeeds in obtaining employment, she gets only half the pay that a man does for the same work. But, it is said, woman's sphere is at home. Would giving her the right to vote interfere with her home duties any more than it does with a man's business? Again it is said, that for her to vote would be unfeminine. Is it at all more indelicate for a woman to go to the polls, than it is for her to go to the court-house and pay her taxes? The truth is, woman occupies just the position that man has placed her in, and it ill becomes him to urge such objections. Give her a chance—give her the opportunity of proving whether these objections are well founded or not. Her influence for good is great, notwithstanding all the disadvantages under which she at present labors; and my firm belief is, that that influence would be greatly enhanced and extended by the exercise of this new right. It would be felt at the ballot-box and in the halls of legislation. Better men, as a general rule, would be elected to office, and society in all its ramifications, would feel and rejoice at the change. A VOTER.

To the General Assembly of the State of Missouri:

GENTLEMEN: The undersigned women of Missouri, believing that all citizens who are taxed for the support of the government and subject to its laws, should have a voice in the making of those laws, and the selection of their rulers; that, as the possession of the ballot ennobles and elevates the character of man, so, in like manner, it would ennoble and elevate that of woman by giving her a direct and personal interest in the affairs of government; and further, believing that the spirit of the age, as well as every consideration of justice and equity, requires that the ballot should be extended to our sex, do unite in praying that an amendment to the constitution may be proposed, striking out the word "male" and extending to women the right of suffrage.

And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

On behalf of the Missouri Woman Suffrage Association.

[Signed:] *President*, Mrs. Francis Minor; *Vice-President*, Mrs. Beverly Allen; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Wm. T. Hazard; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. Geo. D. Hall; *Treasurer*, Mrs. N. Stevens, St. Louis, Missouri.

Copies of the petition, and information furnished upon addressing either of above named officers. Formation of auxiliary associations in every county requested. Petitions when completely signed, to be returned to the head office.

These papers will serve to show that the idea has taken root in other States beyond the Mississippi besides Kansas; and may also be somewhat of a guide to others, who may desire to accomplish the same purpose elsewhere. A work of such magnitude requires, of course, time for development; but the leaven is working. The fountains of the great deep of public thought have been broken up. The errors and prejudices of six thousand years are yielding to the sunlight of truth. In spite of pulpits and politicians, the great idea is making its way to the hearts of the people; and woman may rejoice in believing that the dawn of her deliverance, so long hoped for and prayed for, is at last approaching. F. M.

St. Louis, January, 1868.

The following from *The Revolution* shows that the women of St. Louis were awake on the question of taxation:

The women here have endeavored to find out to what extent taxation without representation, because of sex, obtains in this city, and as the result of their inquiries they are enabled to place on their records the following very suggestive document.

ASSESSOR'S OFFICE, ST. LOUIS, January 30, 1869.

To Mrs. Cousins and Emma Finkelnburg, Committee of the Ladies' Suffrage Association:

In reply to your request to report to your association the amount of property listed in the city of St. Louis in the name of ladies, permit me to state that the property in

question is represented by over 2,000 tax-paying ladies, and assessed at the value of $14,490,199.

Yours very respectfully,

ROBT. J. ROMBAUER, *Assessor.*

This exhibit has opened the eyes of a good many people. "Two thousand on 'em," exclaimed a male friend of mine, "and over fourteen millions of property! Whew! What business have these women with so much money?" Well, they have it, and now they ask us, "Shall 2,000 men, not worth a dollar, just because they wear pantaloons go to the polls and vote taxes on us, while we are excluded from the ballot-box for no other reason than sex?" What *shall* we say to them? They ask us if the American Revolution did not turn on this hinge, *No taxation without representation.* Who can answer?

The advocates of suffrage in St. Louis made their attacks at once in both Church * and State, and left no means of agitation untried. There has never been an association in any State that comprised so many able men and women who gave their best thoughts to every phase of this question, and who did so grand a work, until the unfortunate division in 1871, which seemed to chill the enthusiasm of many friends of the movement.

In the winter of 1869 the association sent a large delegation of ladies to the legislature with a petition containing about 2,000 signatures. A correspondent in *The Revolution*, February 6, 1869, said:

It will not be feminine to say, yet I fear I must say, the women of Missouri have stormed their capitol, and if it is not yet taken, the outworks are in our hands, and I believe with a few more well-directed blows the victory will be ours. On February 3 a large delegation of ladies, representing the Suffrage Association of Missouri, visited Jefferson City for the purpose of laying before the legislature a large and influentially signed petition, asking the ballot for women; and we were gratified to see the great respect and deference shown to the women of Missouri by the wisest and best of her legislators in their respectful and cordial reception of the delegates. Both Houses adjourned, and gave the use of the house for the afternoon, when eloquent addresses were made by Mrs. J. G. Phelps of Springfield, Dr. Ada Greunan of St. Louis, and the future orator of Missouri, Miss Phœbe Couzins, whose able and effective address the press has given in full. Of the brave men who stood up for us, it is more difficult to speak. To give a list would be impossible; for every name would require a eulogy too lengthy for the pages of *The Revolution.* We will, therefore, record them on the tablets of our memory with a hand so firm that they shall stand out brightly till time shall be no more. Of the small majority who oppose us we will say nothing, but throw over them the pall of merciful oblivion.

The first woman suffrage convention ever held in the city of St. Louis, or the State of Missouri, assembled in Mercantile Library, October 6, 7,

* The following we find in the St. Louis papers. It is significant of the sentiment of the Methodist women of the West: "We, the undersigned, join in a call for a mass-meeting of the M. E. Church in St. Louis, to meet at Union Church on the 15th inst., at 3 o'clock P. M., to consider a plan for memorializing the General Conference to permit the ordination of women as ministers. All women of the M. E. Church are requested to attend. Mrs. Henry Kennedy, Mrs. T. C. Fletcher, Mrs. E. O. Stanard, Mrs. A. C. George, Mrs. Lucy Prescott, Mrs. U. B. Wilson, Mrs. L. Jones, Mrs. E. L. Case, Mrs. W. F. Brink, Mrs. S. C. Cummins, Mrs. R. N. Hazard, Mrs. Dutro, Mrs. M. H. Himebaugh." The result of this meeting of the ladies of the Methodist churches to discuss a plan for admitting women into the pulpit as preachers was the appointment of a committee to draft a memorial to the General Conference to meet at Brooklyn, N. Y., asking that body to sanction and provide for the ordination of women as ministers of the Methodist Church.

Digitized by Google

1869. Many distinguished people were on the platform.* At this convention Mr. Francis Minor introduced a very able series of resolutions, on which Mrs. Minor made a remarkably logical address.† The following letter from Mr. Minor shows the careful research he gave to the consideration of this question:

ST. LOUIS, December 30, 1869.

DEAR REVOLUTION: So thoroughly am I satisfied that the surest and most direct course to pursue to obtain a recognition of woman's claim to the ballot, lies through the courts of the country, that I am induced to ask you to republish the resolutions that I drafted, and which were unanimously adopted by the St. Louis convention. And I will here add, that to accomplish this end, and to carry these resolutions into practical effect, it is intended by Mrs. Minor, the president of the State Association, to make a test case in her instance at our next election; take it through the courts of Missouri, and thence to the Supreme Court of the United States at Washington. I think it will be admitted that these resolutions place the cause of woman upon higher ground than ever before asserted, in the fact that for the first time suffrage is claimed as a privilege based upon citizenship, and secured by the Constitution of the United States. It will be seen that the position taken is, that the States have the right to regulate, but not to prohibit, the elective franchise to citizens of the United States. Thus the States may determine the qualifications of electors. They may require the elector to be of a certain age, to have had a fixed residence, to be of a sane mind, and unconvicted of crime, etc., because these are qualifications or conditions that all citizens, sooner or later, may attain; but to go beyond this, and say to one-half the citizens of the State, notwithstanding you possess all these qualifications you shall never vote, is of the very essence of despotism. It is a bill of attainder of the most odious character.

A further investigation of the subject will show that the language of the constitutions of all the States, with the exception of those of Massachusetts and Virginia, on the subject of suffrage is peculiar. They almost all read substantially alike: "White male citizens, etc., shall be entitled to vote," and this is supposed to exclude all other citizens. There is no direct exclusion, except in the two States above named. Now the error lies in supposing that an enabling clause is necessary at all. The right of the people of a State to participate in a government of their own creation requires no enabling clause; neither can it be taken from them by implication. To hold otherwise would be to interpolate in the constitution a prohibition that does not exist. In framing a constitution the people are assembled in their sovereign capacity; and being possessed of all rights and all powers, what is not surrendered is retained. Nothing short of a direct prohibition can work a disseizin of rights that are fundamental. In the language of John Jay to the people of New York, urging the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, "silence and blank paper neither give nor take away anything," and Alexander Hamilton says (*Federalist*, No. 83), "Every man of discernment must at once perceive the wide difference between silence and abolition."

The mode and manner in which the people shall take part in the government of their creation may be prescribed by the constitution, but the right itself is antecedent to all constitutions. It is inalienable, and can neither be bought, nor sold, nor given away. But even if it should be held that this view is untenable, and that women are disfranchised by the several State constitutions directly, or by implication, then I say that such prohibitions are clearly in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, and yield thereto. The language of that instrument is clear aud emphatic: "All per-

* On the platform were Julia Ward Howe, Massachusetts; Lillie Peckham, Wisconsin; Miriam M. Cole, Ohio; Mary A. Livermore, Hon. Sharon Tyndale, Judge Waite and Rev. Mr. Harrison, Illinois; Susan B. Anthony, New York. The officers of the Woman Suffrage Association of Missouri: *President*, Mrs. Francis Minor; *Vice-President*, Mrs. Beverly Allen; *Secretary*, Mrs. William T. Hazard; *Treasurer*, Mrs. George B. Hall; Miss Mary Beady, Miss Phœbe Couzins, Mrs. E. Tittman, Mrs. Alfred Clapp, Miss A. L. Forbes, Isaac H. Sturgeon, Mrs. J. C. Orrick, Mrs. R. J. Lackland, Francis Minor, and many others.

† For speech and resolutions, see Vol. II., page 408.

sons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State wherein they reside." "No State shall make or enforce any law that shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." It would be impossible to add to the force or effect of such language, and equally impossible to attempt to explain it away.

Very respectfully, FRANCIS MINOR.

The St. Louis *Democrat* spoke of the convention as follows:

Readers of our report have doubtless been interested to observe the fair spirit and dignified manner of the woman suffrage convention, and the ability displayed in some of the addresses. It is but due to the managers to say that they extended most courteous invitations to gentlemen not identified with the movement to address the convention, and state freely their objections to the extension of the franchise. Of those invited some were prevented by duties elsewhere from attending. Others, it may be, felt that it would scarcely be a gracious thing, in spite of the liberality of the invitation, to occupy the time of a convention in favor of the extension of the franchise with arguments against it. But the objections which, after all, probably have most weight with candid men are those which it is not easy to discuss in public, namely: "Will not extension of suffrage to women have an injurious effect upon the family and sexual relations?" "Will not the ballot be used rather by that class who would not use it wisely than by those who are most competent?" We do not argue these questions, but are sure that some frank discussion of them, however delicate the subject may be, is necessary to convince the great majority of those who are still doubting or opposed. Meanwhile the reports are of interest, and reflect no little credit upon the women of this city who have taken so prominent a part in the movement.

The officers of the Missouri Society were annually reëlected for several years, and the work proceeded harmoniously until the division in the National Association. The members of the Missouri Society took sides in this division as preference dictated. Mr. and Mrs. Minor, Miss Forbes, Miss Couzins and others were already members of the National Association, and sympathized with its views and modes of pushing the question.

In order that there might be no division in the Missouri Association, a resolution was introduced by Mr. Minor and unanimously adopted, declaring that each member of the society should be free to join the National body of his or her choice, and that the Missouri Association, as a society, should not become auxiliary to either the "National" or the "American." The good faith of the association was thus pledged to respect the feelings and wishes of each member, and as long as this course was observed all went well. But, at the annual meeting in 1871, just after Mrs. Minor had for the fifth time been unanimously reëlected president, in violation of the previous action of the association a resolution was introduced and passed, declaring that the association should henceforth become auxiliary to the American. This gross disregard of the wishes and feelings of those who were members of the National Association left them no alternative, with any feeling of self-respect, but to withdraw; and accordingly Mrs. Minor at once tendered her resignation as president and her withdrawal as a member of the association. She was followed in this course by Mr. Minor, Miss Couzins, Miss Forbes and others.* However, the work went steadily on. Meetings were held regularly from

* Dissension and division were the effect in every State, except where the associations wisely remained independent and all continued to work together, and the forces otherwise expended in rivalry were directed against the common enemy.

Digitized by Google

week to week, with occasional grand conventions, tracts and petitions were circulated, and constant agitation in some way kept up.

In answer to an earnest solicitation for facts and incidents of the suffrage movement in Missouri, Mrs. Rebecca N. Hazard, one of the earliest and most active friends in that State, sends us the following:

I think the cruel war had much to do in educating the women of Missouri into a sense of their responsibilities and duties as citizens; at least all who first took part in the suffrage movement had been active on the Union side during the war, and that having ended in the preservation of the government, they naturally began to inquire as to their own rights and privileges in the restored Union. My own feelings were first fully awakened by the hanging of Mrs. Surrat; for, although a Unionist and an abolitionist, I could but regard her execution by the government, considering her helpless position, as judicial murder. I wrote on the subject to the editor of the New York *Independent.* The letter was handed to Miss Anthony, and resulted in an invitation to the next meeting of the Equal Rights Society. This almost frightened me, for I had hitherto looked askance at the woman's rights movement.

Meeting an old friend and neighbor not long after, the talk turned upon negro suffrage. I expressed myself in favor of that measure, and timidly added, "And go farther—I think women also should vote." She grasped my hand cordially, saying, "And so do I!" This was Mrs. Virginia L. Minor. We had each cherished this opinion, supposing that no other woman in the community held it; and this we afterwards found to have been the experience of many others. This was in 1866; and in the following autumn Mrs. Minor prepared and circulated for signatures a card of thanks to Hon. B. Gratz Brown for the recognition of woman's political rights he had given in the United States Senate in a speech upon extending the suffrage to the women of the District of Columbia.* This card received enough names to justify another step—that of a petition to the Missouri General Assembly. This was headed by Mrs. Minor, and circulated with untiring energy by her, receiving several hundred signatures, and was sent to the legislature during the winter, where it received some degree of favor.

But as yet no effort had been made toward an organization. The first step in that direction was in May, 1867, by Mrs. Lucretia P. Hall and her sister, Miss Penelope Allen, daughters of Mrs. Beverly Allen, and nieces of General Pope, in the parlors of Mrs. Anna L. Clapp, the president of the Union Aid Society during the war. Mrs. Hall, Mrs. Clapp and myself called a public meeting on May 8, when the Woman Suffrage Society of Missouri was organized, with Mrs. Minor president.

In the winter of 1868 the association sent a large delegation of ladies to Jefferson with a petition containing about 2,000 names, to present to the legislature. The Republicans were then in the ascendency, and the ladies having many professed friends among the members, were received with

* For this speech of B. Gratz Brown see Vol. II., page 156.

every demonstration of respect. Addresses were made by Miss Phœbe Couzins and Dr. Ada Greunan. The petition was respectfully considered, and a fair vote given for the submission of an amendment.

Subsequent sessions of the legislature have been besieged, as was also the constitutional convention in 1875; but beyond the passage of several laws improving the general status of women, we have not made much impression upon the law-making power of our State; not so much since the State passed into the hands of the Democrats, as while the Republicans were in the majority.

But the public meetings and social influence of our association have done much for the cause of woman suffrage. Strangers are surprised to find so little prejudice existing against a movement so decidedly unpopular in many places. The convention held in St. Louis in October, 1869, was one of the very best I have ever known, and its influence was long felt for good. In the spring of 1871 our association became auxiliary to the American, and in consequence several of our active members seceded, viz.: Mr. and Mrs. Minor, Miss Couzins, Dr. Greunan and others. In the autumn of 1872 the American Association held its annual meeting in St. Louis.

The law school of Washington University has always been open to women. Miss Couzins was the first to avail herself of its advantages in 1869, though Miss Barkaloo of Brooklyn, denied admission to Columbia Law School, soon joined her, and was admitted to the bar in 1870. While Miss Barkaloo was not the first woman admitted to the bar in the United States, she doubtless was the first to try a case in court. She died after a few months of most promising practice.* Miss Couzins was admitted to the bar in May, 1871.

The St. Louis School of Design, which has done much for woman, was originated by members of our association; principally by Mrs. Mary F. Henderson, who has given untiring effort in that direction. Our members were also instrumental in opening to women the St. Louis Homeopathic Medical College, and active in opposing what was known as the St. Louis "Social Evil Law." They aided Dr. Eliot in his valiant struggle against that iniquity. Mrs. E. Patrick and myself called the first public meeting to protest against the law. It was repealed March 27, 1874.

You are probably familiar with Mrs. Minor's suit to obtain suffrage under the fourteenth amendment. We all admired her courageous efforts for that object. Previous to that attempt our society had earnestly advocated a sixteenth amendment for the protection of woman's right to vote, but held the matter in abeyance pending the suit. After its failure, we again renewed our efforts for a sixteenth amendment, circulating and sending to Washington our petitions. Our association holds monthly meetings and proposes to continue the agitation.† I ought to say, per-

* For full account of Miss Barkaloo see New York chapter, page 404.

† Besides those already named, there are many other women worthy of mention—Mrs. Hannah Stagg, Mrs. George H. Rha, Mrs. S. F. Gruff, Miss N. M. Lavelle, Mrs. Helen E. Starrett, Mrs. A. E. Dickinson, Mrs. E. R. Case, Miss S. Sharman, Mrs. Mary S. Phelps, Miss Mary E. Beedy, Mrs. Fanny O'Haly, Mrs. J. C. Orrick, Miss Henrietta Moore, Mrs. Stephen Ridgeley, Mrs. M. E. Bedford, Mrs. M. Jackson; and among our German friends are Mrs. Rosa Tittman, Mrs. Dr. Fiala, Mrs. Lena Hildebrand, Mrs. G. G. Fenkelnberg, Mrs. Rombauer, Miss Lidergerber.

haps, that our society lends all the help possible to other States. It gave $520 to Michigan in 1874, and $200 to Colorado in 1877. R. N. H.

To bring the question of woman's right as a citizen of the United States to vote for United States officers before the judiciary, Mrs. Minor attempted to register in order to vote at the national election in November, 1872, and being refused on account of her sex, brought the matter before the courts in the shape of a suit against the registering officer.* The point was decided adversely to her in all the courts, being finally reported in Vol. 21 of Wallace's U. S. Supreme Court Reports. The importance of this decision cannot be over-estimated. It affects every citizen of the United States, male as well as female, if, as there pronounced, the United States has no voters of its own creation. The Dred-Scott decision is insignificant in comparison. Mrs. Minor made the following points in her petition:

1. As a *citizen* of the United States, the plaintiff is entitled to any and all the "privileges and immunities" that belong to such position however defined; and as are held, exercised and enjoyed by other citizens of the United States.

2. The elective franchise is a "privilege" of citizenship, in the highest sense of the word. It is the privilege preservative of all rights and privileges; and especially of the right of the citizen to participate in his or her government.

3. The denial or abridgment of this privilege, if it exist at all, must be sought only in the fundamental charter of government—the Constitution of the United States. If not found there, no inferior power or jurisdiction can legally claim the right to exercise it.

4. But the Constitution of the United States, so far from recognizing or permitting any denial or abridgment of the privileges of citizens, expressly declares that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

5. It follows that the provisions of the Missouri constitution and registry law before recited are in conflict with, and must yield to the paramount authority of, the Constitution of the United States.

At a mass meeting held in St. Louis January 25, 1875, a committee † was appointed to prepare an address to the people of the State, setting forth the necessity of such action by the constitutional convention, soon to assemble, as would insure to all citizens the right of choice in their lawmakers and in the officers whose duty it should be to execute the laws. The address was prepared and widely circulated over the State. In June, the convention being in session at Jefferson, Mrs. Minor, Miss Couzins, and Mrs. Dickinson went to the capitol and were granted a gracious hearing, but no action was conceded.

In May, 1879, the National Woman Suffrage Association held its annual meeting at St. Louis, holding its session through the day, morning, afternoon and evening, and so much interest was aroused that on May 13 a local society was organized under the head of the National Woman Suffrage Association for St. Louis,‡ with Mrs. Minor president, which has con-

* For a full report of Mrs. Minor's trial, see History of Woman Suffrage, Vol. II., page 715.

† The committee were: J. B. Merwin, Virginia L. Minor, John Snyder, Lydia F. Dickinson, Maria E. F. Jackson.

‡ The officers were: *President*, Mrs. Virginia L. Minor; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. Eliza J. Patrick, Mrs. Caroline J. Todd, Miss Phœbe W. Couzins; *Executive Committee*, Mrs. E. P. Johnson, Mrs. W. W. Polk; *Secretary*, Miss Eliza B. Buckley; *Treasurer*, Miss Maggie Baumgartner.

tinued to do most efficient service to the present. During the summer of 1879, Mrs. Minor refused to pay the tax assessed against her:

ST. LOUIS, MO., August 26, 1879.

Hon. DAVID POWERS, *President Board of Assessors:* I honestly believe and conscientiously make oath that I have not one dollars' worth of property subject to taxation. The principle upon which this government rests is representation before taxation. My property is denied representation, and therefore can not be taxable. The law which you quote as applicable to me in your notice to make my tax return is in direct conflict with section 30 of the bill of rights of the constitution of the State which declares, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law," And that surely cannot be due process of law wherein one of the parties only is law-maker, judge, jury and executioner, and the other stands silenced, denied the power either of assent or dissent, a condition of "involuntary slavery" so clearly prohibited in section 31 of the same article, as well as in the Constitution of the United States, that no legislation or judicial prejudice can ignore it. I trust you will believe it is from no disrespect to you that I continue to refuse to become a party to this injustice by making a return of property to your honorable body, as clearly the duties of a citizen can only be exacted where rights and privileges are equally accorded. Respectfully, VIRGINIA L. MINOR.

Again, in February, 1881, Mrs. Minor made an able argument before the legislative committee on constitutional amendments in support of the petition for the enfranchisement of the women of the State. Her pivotal point was, "By whatever tenure you, as one-half of the people, hold it, we, the other half, claim it by the same." And again in December of the same year at a meeting of the Knights and Ladies of the Father Matthew Debating Club, at which the subject was, "Is the woman's rights movement to be encouraged?" Patrick Long, Daniel O'Connel Tracy, Richard D. Kerwen, spoke in the affirmative; several gentlemen and two ladies in opposition, when Mrs. Minor, who was in the audience, was called out amid great applause, to which she responded in an able speech, showing that the best temperance weapon in the hands of woman is the ballot.

Of the initial steps taken for the elevation of women in the little village of Oregon, Mrs. Annie R. Irvine writes:

The Woman's Union, an independent literary club, designed to improve the mental, moral, and physical condition of women, held its first meeting in Oregon, Holt county, on the evening of January 6, 1872, at the residence of Dr. Asher Goslin. Temporary officers were elected, and a committee appointed to prepare by-laws for the government of the club. Six ladies* were present. The succeeding meetings grew in interest, and took strong hold upon the minds of all classes, from the fact that hitherto no outlet had been found for the energies of our women outside the circle of home and church. During the first two years of its existence, the Woman's Union had to bear in a small way, many of the sneers and taunts attending more pretentious organizations, but luckily, when the novelty wore off, we were allowed to pursue the quiet tenor of our way, with an occasional slur at the "strong-minded" tendency of

* They were, Mrs. S. L. Goslin, Mrs. A. E. Goslin, Mrs. M. M. Soper, Annie E. Batcheller, Mary Curry, Annie R. Irvine.

Digitized by Google

the organization. During nearly fourteen years we have held regular meetings in a hall rented for the purpose, and paid for by earnings of the society. An excellent organ is owned by the club; they have a library of several hundred volumes, book-cases, carpet, curtains, pictures, tables, chairs, stove, etc., and the members take great pride in their cosy headquarters. At this writing, interesting meetings are held on each Wednesday evening at the homes of the different members of the society.* In the course of so long a time, this organization has had many changes. Members have removed to all parts of the United States, and many similar clubs elsewhere trace their origin to our society.

Several years ago an open letter from here to "Woman's Kingdom," in the Chicago *Inter-Ocean* called attention to our plan of work for small towns; as a result fifteen similar Unions were organized, some of them still flourishing. In northwest Missouri the same kind of clubs were formed in Maryville, Nodaway county, and Savannah, Andrew county, but neither of them became permanent. In the course of twelve years many of the best speakers on the American platform have addressed Oregon audiences, brought here by the determined efforts of a few women. To-day, public opinion in this part of Missouri is in advance of other sections on all questions relating to the great interests of humanity. In March, 1879, a call signed by prominent citizens † brought together a large assembly of men and women in the court-house. An address in favor of woman suffrage was delivered by Rev. John Wayman of the M. E. Church of St. Joseph. Mr. James L. Allen acted as chairman of the meeting, and a society was then organized, to bear the name of the Holt County Woman Suffrage Society. At the National Woman Suffrage Convention held at St. Louis later in the same year, Jas. L. Allen acted as delegate from this association and reported our progress. The best organized woman's society in the State is probably the Women's Christian Temperance Union. In its different departments, although hampered by too much theological red tape, it is reaching thousands of ignorant, prejudiced, good sectarian women who would expect the "heavens to fall" if they accidentally got into a meeting where "woman's rights" was mentioned even in a whisper. Mrs. Clara Hoffman, of Kansas City, is State president, and a woman of great force. She, as well as other leading lights in the Women's Christian Temperance Union, is strongly advocating woman suffrage as a *sine qua non* in the temperance work. The women of this part of the State have been given quite a prominent place among organizations mentioned in a late "History of Missouri, by Counties." The Woman's Union has taken the

---

* *President*, Emma G. Dobyns; *Vice-President*, Kate Evans Thatcher; *Secretary*, Matilda C. Shutts; *Treasurer*, Lucy S. Rancher; *Corresponding Secretary*, Annie R. Irvine.

† Believing that the best interests of society, as well as government, would be best served by admitting all citizens to the full rights of citizenship, we, the undersigned, hereby give notice that a meeting will be held at the court-house, Oregon, on Saturday, March 1, 1879, at 2 p. m., for the purpose of organizing a Woman Suffrage Association. Those interested are urged to attend. Clarke Irvine, C. W. Lukens, James L. Allen, S. B. Lukens, Samuel Stuckey, Sudia Johnson, D. J. Lukens, Elvira Broedbeck, Mary Curry, Jas. B. Curry, Annie R. Irvine.

place of honor.* From the very outset we have had the most bitter and persistent opposition from the churches, more particularly the Presbyterian, although some of our most capable members were of that faith. Exceptions should be made in favor of the Christian, or Campbellite, and as a general thing, the M. E. churches. The greatest shock we have had to resist, however, came a few months since in the shape of a division among our own members, and has really discouraged the more independent among us more than anything else. The W. C. T. U. sent their Mascatine organizer here, to wake up the women in the interests of the State society. Although ignorant and prejudiced, he created a fanatical stampede, and in the goodness of their hearts and the weakness of their heads, our church women in the Woman's Union proposed to give to the three temperance clubs, numbering perhaps 150, the free use of our rooms and property, and suspend our own club, claiming that our mission was ended, and that a field of greater usefulness was opened in the W. C. T. U. line of work. The liberal element refused to abandon the old organization, although many joined in the W. C. T. U. work and attended both clubs.

However, in a small community, where the consciences of many good women are not free, we have met with serious drawbacks. We have had to submit to a sort of boycotting process, for some time, the orthodox, goody-goody people evidently trying to freeze us out; although I must claim that nearly every member of the Woman's Union is strongly interested in the temperance cause, and as the different departments in the W. C. T. U. fail to cover the ground we occupy, quite a respectable number seem determined to hold on in their own way, trying little by little to better the condition of all, and particularly to increase and strengthen the feeble germ of independent thought in women, so often smothered and destroyed by too much theology. What we need for women is not more spirituality but more hard common-sense, applied to reform as well as religion. One thing connected with our organization is a matter of pride to all women, namely, that no pecuniary obligation has ever been repudiated by the Woman's Union. Besides paying our debts we have given hundreds of dollars to works of charity and education, and keep a standing fund of $100, to be used in case of emergency, when, as often happens, we fail to make expenses on lectures, entertainments, etc. It would not be claiming too much if the Woman's Union of Oregon was

* In 1875 I made my first visit to Oregon, and remember my surprise at meeting so large a circle of bright, intelligent women. After taking an old stage at Travesty city, and lumbering along two miles or more over bad roads on a dull day in March into a very unpropitious looking town, my heart sank at the prospect of the small audience I should inevitably have in such a spot. Wondering as to the character of the people I should find, we jolted round the town to the home of the editor and his charming wife, Mrs. Lucy S. Rancher. Their cordial welcome and generous hospitalities soon made the old stage, the rough roads, and the dull town but dim memories of the past. One after another the members of the Union club came to greet me, and I saw in that organization of strong, noble women, wisdom enough to redeem the whole State of Missouri from its apathy on the question of woman's rights. One of the promising features of the efforts of the immortal six women who took the initiative, was the full sympathy shown by their husbands in their attempts to improve themselves and the community. Miss Couzins and Miss Anthony soon followed me, and were alike surprised and delighted with the Literary Club of Oregon. I was there again in '77, and was entertained by Mrs. R. A. Norman, now living in St. Joseph, and in '79, I stayed in a large, old-fashioned brick house near the public square with Mrs. Montgomery, then "fat, fair and forty," and all three visits, with the teas and dinners at the homes of different members of the club, I thoroughly enjoyed.—[E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

to go upon the historic page as the only free, independent woman's club ever successfully carried on for any length of time, in the great State of Missouri.*

Missouri has always felt a becoming pride in the gifted daughter, Miss Phœbe Couzins, who was the first woman to enter the law school, go through the entire course, and graduate with honor to herself and her native State. Hence, a reception to her, to mark such an event, was preëminently fitting. This compliment was paid to her by Dr. and Mrs. G. A. Walker, and a large gathering of the elite of St. Louis honored her with their presence.† The drawing-rooms were festooned with garlands of evergreens and brilliant forest leaves and hanging-baskets of roses; the bountiful tables were elaborately decorated with fruits and flowers and statuettes, while pictures of distinguished women looked down from the wall on every side. After the feast came letters, toasts and speeches, a brilliant address of welcome was given by Dr. Walker, and an equally brilliant reply by Miss Couzins. Witty and complimentary speeches were made by Judge Krum, Hon. Albert Todd, Mrs. Francis Minor, ex-Governor Stanard, Judge Reber, Professor Riley, I. E. Meeker, Mrs. Henrietta Noa. Congratulatory letters were received from several ladies and gentlemen of national reputation, and the following regrets:

Rev. W. G. Eliot, chancellor of the University, with "compliments and thanks to Dr. and Mrs. Walker. I regret that engagements this evening prevent me from enjoying the pleasure of meeting Miss Couzins and welcoming her to her new and well-deserved honors, as I had expected to do until an hour ago."

James E. Yeatman sent regrets accompanied with "his warmest congratulations to Miss Couzins, with best wishes for her success in the noble profession of the law."

George Partridge regrets, "hoping every encouragement will be given to those who aspire to high honors by their intellectual and moral attainments."

General J. H. Hammond, Kansas City, Mo.: "I would feel honored in being allowed the privilege of congratulating this lady who so practically honors her sex."

In addition to the many congratulations showered upon Miss Couzins, she was the recipient of testimonials of a more enduring

* Among progressive women in this part of Missouri, Mrs. Adela M. Kelly, of Savannah, wife of Circuit Judge Henry S. Kelly, is prominent; in Mound City, Mrs. Emma K. Hershberger, Mrs. Mary L. Mamcher, Mrs. Mary C. Tracy, Mrs. Fanny Smith, and others, are leading women, and were once residents here, and members of the Woman's Union. Among those actively interested here now, I shall only mention a few, Mrs. Nancy Hershberger, Mary Curry, Elvira Broedbeck, Lucy A. Christian, Ella O. Fallon, Mary Stirrell, and many others.

† Among those present were the following ladies and gentlemen: Dr. and Mrs. Walker, Phœbe Couzins, esq., Hon. and Mrs. John B. Henderson, Gov. and Mrs. E. O. Stanard, Mr. and Mrs. Chester H. Krum, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Minor, Mr. and Mrs. Wm. Patrick, Major and Mrs. J. E. D. Couzins, Major and Mrs. J. R. Meeker, Major and Mrs. W. S. Pope, Mr. and Mrs. Lippmann, Mr. and Mrs. Leopold Noa, Miss Noa, Miss A. L. Forbes, Judge Krum, Judge Reber, Judge Todd, Geo. M. Stuart (dean), Prof. Riley, State Entomologist; Prof. Hager, State Geologist; J. R. Stuart, artist, and others.

and equally flattering character. Among many valuable presents were twelve volumes of Edmund Burke from Miss A. L. Forbes, who wished to testify her appreciation of the event by deeds rather than words. Mrs. E. O. Stanard presented a handsomely-bound set of "Erskine's Speeches," in five volumes. There were other gifts of great intrinsic worth. These tokens of regard were sent from admiring friends scattered all over the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Although Miss Couzins has never practiced in her chosen profession, yet the knowledge and discipline acquired in the study of our American system of jurisprudence and constitutional law have been of essential service to her in the prolonged arguments on the enfranchisement of woman, in which she has so ably and eloquently advocated the case of the great plaintiff of the nineteenth century, in that famous law-suit begun by Margaret Fuller in 1840, "Woman versus Man." Our junior advocate has taken the case into the highest courts and made her appeals to a jury of the sovereign people and "the judgment of a candid world." On all principles of precedent and importance our case now stands first on the calendar. When will the verdict be rendered and what will it be?

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XLV.

IOWA.

Beautiful Scenery—Liberal in Politics and Reforms—Legislation for Women—No Right yet to Joint Earnings—Early Agitation—Frances Dana Gage, 1854—Mrs. Bloomer Before the Territorial Legislature, 1856—Mrs. Martha H. Brinkerhoff—Mrs. Annie Savery, 1868—County Associations Formed in 1869—State Society Organized at Mt. Pleasant, 1870, Henry O'Connor, President—Mrs. Cutler Answers Judge Palmer—First Annual Meeting, Des Moines—Letter from Bishop Simpson—The State Register Complimentary—Mass-Meeting at the Capitol—Mrs. Savery and Mrs. Harbert—Legislative Action—Methodist and Universalist Churches Indorse Woman Suffrage—Republican Plank, 1874—Governor Carpenter's Message, 1876—Annual Meeting, 1882, Many Clergymen Present—Five Hundred Editors Interviewed—Miss Hindman and Mrs. Campbell—Mrs. Callanan Interviews Governor Sherman, 1884—Lawyers—Governor Kirkwood Appoints Women to Office—County Superintendents—Elizabeth S. Cook—Journalism—Literature—Medicine—Ministry—Inventions—President of a National Bank—The Heroic Kate Shelly—Temperance—Improvement in the Laws.

THE euphonious Indian name, Iowa, signifying "the beautiful land," is peculiarly appropriate to those gently undulating prairies, decorated in the season of flowers with a brilliant garniture of honey-suckles, jassamines, wild roses and violets, watered with a chain of picturesque lakes and rivers, chasing each other into the bosom of the boundless Mississippi. The motto on the great seal of the State, "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain," is the key-note to the successive struggles made there to build up a community of moral, virtuous, intelligent people, securing justice, liberty and equality to all. Iowa has been the State to give large Republican majorities; to prohibit the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors by a constitutional amendment; and to present propositions before her legislature for eight successive sessions to give the right of suffrage to woman. In the article on Iowa, in the American Cyclopædia, the writer says: "No distinction is made in law between the husband and the wife in regard to property. One-third in value of all the real estate of either, upon the death of the other, goes to the survivor in fee simple. Neither is liable for the separate debts of the other. The wife may make contracts and incur liabilities which may be enforced

by or against her in the same manner as if she was unmarried; and so a married woman may sue and be sued without the husband being joined in the action." Many women living in Iowa often quote these laws with pride, showing the liberality of their rulers as far as they go. But in new countries the number of women that inherit property is very small compared to the number that work all their days to help pay for their humble homes. It is in the right to these joint earnings where the wife is most cruelly defrauded, because the mother of a large family, who washes, irons, cooks, bakes, patches and darns, takes care of the children, labors from early dawn to midnight in her own home, is not supposed to earn anything, hence owns nothing, and all the labors of a long life, the results of her thrift and economy, belong absolutely to the husband, so that when he dies they call it liberality for the husband to make his partner an heir, and give her one-third of their joint earnings.

For this chapter we are indebted to Mrs. Amelia Bloomer, who moved into this State from New York in the spring of 1855 with her husband, who commenced the practice of law in Council Bluffs, where they have resided ever since. Mrs. Bloomer had been the editor for several years of a weekly paper called the *Lily*, which advocated both temperance and woman's rights, and for the six years of its publication was of inestimable value alike to both reforms. She was one of the earliest champions of the woman's rights movement, and as writer, editor and lecturer, did much to forward the cause in its infancy.*

The first agitation of the question of woman suffrage in Iowa was in the summer of 1854, when Frances Dana Gage of Ohio gave a series of lectures in the southeastern section of the State on temperance and woman's rights. Letters written to *Lily* at the time show that large audiences congregated to see and hear a woman publicly proclaiming the wrongs of her sex, and demanding equal rights before the law. During the year 1855 the writer gave several lectures at Council Bluffs, and in January,

* In 1849 her husband was appointed post-master, she became his deputy, was duly sworn in, and during the administration of Taylor and Fillmore served in that capacity. When she assumed her duties the improvement in the appearance and conduct of the office was generally acknowledged. A neat little room adjoining became a kind of ladies' exchange where those coming from different parts of the town could meet to talk over the contents of the last *Lily* and the progress of the woman suffrage movement in general. Those who enjoyed the brief interregnum of a woman in the post-office, can readily testify to the loss to the ladies of the village and the void felt by all when Mrs. Bloomer and the *Lily* left for the West and men again reigned supreme.

Mr. and Mrs. Bloomer removed to Mt. Vernon, Ohio, in 1853, and the publication of the *Lily* was continued; she was also the associate editor of the *Western Home Visitor*. Mrs. Bloomer lectured in the principal cities of Ohio and throughout the north-west, and was one of a committee of five appointed to memorialize the legislature of Ohio for a prohibitory law, and assisted in the formation of several lodges of Good Templars.

Digitized by Google

1856, by invitation, addressed the second territorial legislature of Nebraska, in Representative Hall, Omaha; and in the year following lectured in Council Bluffs, Omaha, Nebraska City, Glenwood and other towns.

In 1868 Mrs. Martha H. Brinkerhoff made a very successful lecture-tour through the northern counties of Iowa. She roused great interest and organized many societies, canvassing meanwhile for subscribers to *The Revolution.* In the same year Mrs. Annie C. Savery gave a lecture for the benefit of a blind editor at Des Moines. In February, 1870, by invitation, she responded to a toast at a Masonic festival in that city; and during that and the year following she lectured in several places on woman suffrage, and wrote many able articles for the press.

On April 17, 1869, the "Northern Woman Suffrage Association" was organized at Dubuque.* This was the first society in Iowa, though about the same time others were being organized in different localities. J. L. McCreery, in his editorial position, advocated the enfranchisement of woman, and wrote an able paper in favor of the object of the organization. Mrs. Mary N. Adams opened a correspondence with friends of the movement in other parts of the State; Henry O'Connor, Mary A. Livermore and others lectured before the society, thus educating the people into a better understanding of woman's rights and needs. Mrs. Adams not only addressed the home society, but gave lectures before lyceums and educational institutions.

Des Moines has always maintained the most successful organization, having a band of earnest women enlisted in the work, and being the capital of the State, where every opportunity was afforded to facilitate their efforts. The liberality of the press, too, aided vastly in moulding public sentiment in favor of the cause. About the earliest work done in that city was in June, 1870, when Hannah Tracy Cutler and Amelia Bloomer (immediately on returning from the formation of the State Society at Mt, Pleasant) held two meetings there—one in the open air on the grounds where the new capitol now stands, on the question of temperance, Sunday afternoon, presided over by Governor Merrill; the other in the Baptist Church, on woman suffrage, the following evening, Mrs. Annie C. Savery presiding.

The Polk County Woman Suffrage Society was formed October 25, and has never failed to hold its meetings regularly each month since that time. Every congress and every legislature have been appealed to by petitions signed by thousands of the best citizens, and it is on record that the senators and representatives of Polk county, with one exception,† have always voted in favor of submitting the question of woman's enfranchisement to the electors of the State. When men are talked of for legislative honors they are interviewed by a committee from the society, and pledges secured that they will vote "aye" on any woman suffrage bill that may come before them.

This society has from time to time engaged the services of prominent

* The officers were: *President*, Mrs. D. S. Wilson; *Vice-President*, Mrs. W. P. Sage; *Secretary*, Mrs. J. S. McCreery; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Mary N. Adams.

† Frank Allen.

Digitized by Google

lecturers,* and nearly all of the ministers and lawyers of the city have given addresses in favor of the cause. Only one minister has openly and bitterly opposed the measure, and his sermon on the "Subordination of Woman," published in the *Register*, called out spirited replies from Mrs. Savery and Mrs. Bloomer in the same journal, which completely demolished the flimsy fancies of the gentleman.

About 1874 Mrs. Maria Orwig edited a column in the *Record*, and Mary A. Work a column in the *Republican*. Since 1880, Mesdames Hunter, Orwig, Woods and Work have filled two columns in *The Prohibitionist*, of which Laura A. Berry is one of the editors. Mrs. M. J. Coggeshall has for several years served the society as reporter for the *Register*, proving herself a very ready and interesting writer. All of these ladies are efficient and untiring in whatever pertains to woman's interest.† The *Register* says:

> The field of labor in Des Moines is pretty well occupied by the ladies. You will find them at the desks in the county and United States court-houses, in the pension office, in the insurance office, in the State offices, behind the counters in stores, in attorneys' offices—aud there is one woman who assists her husband at the blacksmith's trade, and she can strike as hard a blow with a sledge as the brawniest workman in the shop.

In the autumn of 1870 a society was organized at Burlington, with fifty members. One of the earliest advocates of the cause in this place was Mary A. P. Darwin, president of the association, who lectured through the southern tier of counties during the summer of 1870. She was an earnest and forcible speaker.

At Oskaloosa the opening work was done in 1854 by Frances D. Gage, who gave four lectures there, and roused the people to thought and discussion. Mattie Griffith Davenport has long filled a prominent place in the woman suffrage movement in that city. She commenced lecturing in 1868, and during that and the two succeeding years traveled over much of the State, speaking upon temperance and woman's rights. During 1879 she edited a column of the Davenport *News* in the interest of suffrage. In the summer of 1870 Mrs. Cutler and Mrs. Bloomer held two meetings in Oskaloosa, in one of which a gentleman engaged in the discussions, and as is usual in such encounters, the women having right and justice on their side, came out the victors; at least so said the listeners. Following this a Woman's Suffrage Society was organized.‡ Many prominent speakers lectured here in turn, and helped to keep up the interest.

Council Bluffs also organized a society § in 1870, holding frequent meetings and sociables. There is here a large element in favor of the ballot

---

* Lucy Stone, Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony, Mrs. Cutler, Mrs. Livermore, Anna Dickinson, Phœbe Couzins, Mrs. Swisshelm, Miss Hindman and Mrs. Campbell, from abroad; Mesdames Savery, Callanan, Gray, Pittman, Boynton Harbert, Brown, and Messrs. Fuller, Pomeroy, Rutkay, Cole and Maxwell, of the city, have each in turn come to the aid and encouragement of the society's work.

† For information regarding Des Moines I am indebted to Mary A. Work, one of the most able advocates of woman suffrage in the State.

‡ *President*, Porte Welch; *Secretary*, Mattie Griffith Davenport.

§ *President*, Amelia Bloomer; *Vice-Presidents*, C. Munger and Mary McPherson; *Recording Secretary*, Ada McPherson; *Corresponding Secretary*, Will Shoemaker; *Treasurer*, E. S. Barnett.

Digitized by Google

for woman; and though we are unfortunate in not having an advocate in the press, still Council Bluffs will give a good report of itself when the question of woman's enfranchisement shall come before the electors for action. The trustees of the public library of this city are women; the librarian is a woman: the post-office is in the hands of a woman; the teachers in the public schools, with one or two exceptions, are women; the principal of the high school is a woman; and a large number of the clerks in the dry goods stores are women. Miss Ingelletta Smith received the nomination of the Republican party for school superintendent in the fall of 1881, but was defeated by her Democratic competitor.

Marshalltown had a suffrage organization as early as July, 1870.* Nettie Sanford lectured in several of the central counties of the State during that and the previous year. Josephine Guthrie, professor of Belles-Lettres at Le Grand College, in a series of able articles in the Marshalltown *Times* in 1869, claimed for women equality of rights before the law. In 1873, Abbie Gifford, a woman of high culture and an experienced teacher, was elected to the office of county superintendent of the public schools of Marshall county, by a handsome majority; she was reëlected, serving, in all, four years.

At Algona a society † was formed in 1871. At the annual meeting of the State Society at Des Moines, in 1873, Lizzie B. Read delivered an address entitled, "Coming Up Out of the Wilderness," and in July, 1875, at a mass-meeting at Clear Lake, one on "The Bible in Favor of Woman Suffrage." Mrs. Read, formerly as Miss Bunnel, published a paper called the *Mayflower*, at Peru, Indiana, and in 1865 a county paper in this State called the *Upper Des Moines*.

Since 1875 Jackson county has had an efficient Equal Rights Society.‡ On July 4, 1876, Nancy R. Allen, at the general celebration at Maquoketa, the county-seat, read the "Protest and Declaration of Rights," issued by the National Association from its Centennial Parlors in Philadelphia. It was well received by the majority of the people assembled; but, as usual, there were some objectors. The Presbyterian minister published a series of articles in the *Sentinel*, to each of which Mrs. Allen replied ably defending the principles of the Woman Suffrage party. The Maquoketa Equal Rights Society celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of the woman's rights movement July 19, 1878, by holding a public meeting in Dr. Allen's grounds, in the shade of the grand old trees. It was a large gathering, and many prominent gentlemen of the city, by their presence and words of cheer, gave dignity to the occasion. Jackson county has long honored women with positions of trust. The deputy recorder is a woman; Mrs. Allen was notary public; Mrs. Patton was nominated for auditor by the Greenback party in 1880, but was defeated with the rest of

* Its officers were: *President*, Nettie Sanford; *Secretary*, Mrs. Fred. Baum; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Dr. Whealen.

† *President*, M. W. Stough; *Secretary*, Lizzie B. Read. Mrs. Read was president of the State society in 1873, and Mrs. C. A. Ingham in 1881.

‡ *President*, Hon. John E. Goodenow; *Vice-Presidents*, Nancy R. Allen, Mrs. M. J. Stephens, Mrs. A. B. Wilbur; *Secretary*, Mrs. E. D. Stewart; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Julia Dunham; *Treasurer*, Mrs. T. P. Connell; *Executive Committee*, Mrs. S. Stephens, Mrs. Julia Doe, Mrs. Polly Hamley, Dr. J. H. Allen, W. S. Belden.

Digitized by Google

the ticket. Women are book-keepers, merchants, clerks, teachers; and, in fact, almost every avenue is open to them.

Of Fort Dodge, Mrs. Haviland writes: "The subject has never been much agitated here. I have stood almost alone these long years, watching the work done by my sisters in other parts of the State, and hoping the time would soon come when some move could be made in this place. Last spring the annual meeting of our State Society was held here, but it was with difficulty that I found places where the few who came could be entertained, people were so afraid of woman's rights. After the refusal of the other churches, the Baptists opened theirs; the crowd of curious ones looked on and seemed surprised when they failed to discover the 'horns.'" Mrs. A. M. Swain also writes: "Miss Anthony came here first in June, 1871, and has been here twice since. Mrs. Swisshelm was here in 1874. Both were my guests when no other doors were open to the advocates of woman suffrage. The late convention of the State Society held here was a decided success; the best class of ladies attended; the dignity and ability shown in the management, and the many interesting and logical papers read disarmed all criticism and awakened genuine interest. I have handed in my ballot for several years, but it has never been received or counted."

Societies were organized in 1869 and 1870, in Independence and Monticello. Humboldt, Nevada, West Union, Corning, Osceola, Muscatine, Sigourney, Garden Grove, Decorah, Hamburg, and scores of other towns have their local societies. At West Liberty Mrs. Mary V. Cowgill and her good husband are liberal contributors to the work, both State and National.

At a convention held at Mt. Pleasant, June 17, 18, 1870, different sections of the State being well represented, the Iowa Woman Suffrage Society * was formed. Belle Mansfield, president, Frank Hatton,† editor of the Mt. Pleasant *Journal*, secretary. W. R. Cole opened the convention with prayer. After many able addresses from various speakers,‡ in response to an invitation from the president, Judge Palmer in a somewhat excited manner stated his objections to woman's voting. He wanted some guarantee that good would result from giving her the ballot. He thought "she did not understand driving, and would upset the sleigh. Men had always rowed the boat, and therefore always should. Men had more force and muscle than women, and therefore should have all the power in their hands." He spoke of himself as the guardian of his wife, and said she did not want to vote. After talking an hour in this style, he took his seat, greatly to the relief of his hearers. Mrs. Cutler, in her

---

* *President*, Henry O'Connor; *Vice-Presidents*, Amelia Bloomer, Nettie Sanford, Mrs. Frank Palmer, Joseph Dugdale, John P. Irish; *Secretary*, Belle Mansfield; *Corresponding Secretary*, Annie C. Savery; *Executive Committee*, Mary A. P. Darwin, Mattie Griffith Davenport, Mrs. J. L. McCreery, Rev. Augusta Chapin, Hon. Charles Beardsley.

† Assistant postmaster-general under President Arthur.

‡ Mary A. P. Darwin, professor of the college, and Hon. Charles Beardsley, editor of the *Hawkeye*, Burlington; Hon. Henry O'Connor, Muscatine; Mary N. Adams, Dubuque; Annie C. Savery, Des Moines; Amelia Bloomer, Council Bluffs; A. P. Lowrie, Marshalltown; Mrs. Beavers, Valisca. Hannah Tracy Cutler of Illinois, was the leading speaker; Edwin A. Studwell of New York representing *The Revolution*, Col. George Corkhill, Joseph Dugdale, Rev. Mr. Cooper, Mt. Pleasant, were also in attendance.

Digitized by Google

calm, dignified, deliberate manner, answered his arguments. She proved conclusively that muscular force was not the power most needed in our government. If it were, all the little, weak men and women, no matter how intellectual must stand aside, and let only the strong, muscular do the voting and governing. In clearness of perception, and readiness of debate, she distanced her opponent altogether in the opinion of the convention.

The first annual meeting of the State Society was held at Des Moines, October 19, 1871. Mrs. Bloomer presided* in the absence of the president, Gen. O'Connor, Speakers had been engaged for this convention, a good representation secured, and every arrangement made for a successful meeting. And such it was, barring a difference of opinion among the friends of the movement as to what questions should properly come before a society whose only object, as declared in its constitution, was to secure suffrage for women. The following letters were received:

IOWA CITY, October 11, 1871.

Mrs. ANNIE SAVERY—*Dear Madam:* Your kind and very flattering invitation to address the Woman's State Suffrage Convention, in Des Moines, reached me just prior to my departure for this city, and I avail myself of my first leisure to respond. It would not only give me great pleasure, but I should esteem it among my higher duties to accept your invitation, and give my emphatic endorsement to the great reform movement represented by the woman suffrage convention, were it at all practicable. But I have just reached my new charge, and can not dispose of immediate pressing claims upon my time and effort here. Please accept my apology for declining, and believe me, ever yours for woman's enfranchisement. C. R. POMEROY.

INDIANOLA, Sept. 30, 1871.

Mrs. ANNIE SAVERY—*Madam:* I am in receipt of your letter, asking me to take part in your annual convention. I thank you for the honor, as I expect from such a convention results the most salutary, not only to the condition of woman, but also to the progress of our young and vigorous commonwealth. I have read carefully the circular enclosed in your letter, and consider the logic irrefutable, and its suggestions well worthy the attention of all who desire the complete enfranchisement of woman. I fear that I shall not be able to attend, but if I am, I shall be with you, should I do no more than say "Amen" to the words of my eloquent countryman, O'Connor, whom I learn you have honored with the presidency of your association. Wishing for your cause the fullest success, I subscribe myself—one for the enfranchisement of woman.

ALEXANDER BURNS.

A letter was also received from Bishop Matthew Simpson, of the Methodist church, who was always ready to declare his adherence to this great reform:

OWATOMA, Oct. 2, 1871.

Hon. J. HARLAN—*Dear Senator:* Yours, inclosing Mrs. Savery's kind invitation, was received before I left Mankota. I would be pleased to comply with her invitation, joined as it is with your earnest solicitation. But I am under bonds—if not to keep the peace, at least to keep silence—so far as either sermons or public addresses are concerned, until the full restoration of my health. I am glad to say my health is improving. I have presided at five conferences this fall—two still await me. But I have not ventured any extra labor, nor dare I for some time to come. Please convey to

* The speakers were Mr. Rutkay, Mrs. Sanford, Mrs. Bloomer, Mrs. Spaulding, Mrs. Savery. Encouraging letters were read from Joseph A. Dugdale, and Hon. Henry O'Connor, president of the association. The officers for 1871 were: *President*, Mrs. Amelia Bloomer; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. Belle Mansfield; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Annie Savery; *Treasurer*, Mrs. M. Callanan.

Digitized by Google

Mrs. Savery my thanks for her kind invitation, and say to her that I sympathize fully with the suffrage association in its desire to attain for women the ballot.

A series of resolutions was discussed, other letters read, and a large number of new converts joined the association. The *State Register* spoke in a very complimentary manner of the deliberations of this convention:

It is but just, perhaps, that we should say, in general terms, of the State woman suffrage convention, in session in Des Moines the past week, that its proceedings were characterized with good sense, dignity, and the best of order. The world has had an impression for five or six thousand years that women cannot talk without wrangling, counsel without confusion. Again, many are so unjust as to imagine that a convention composed of ladies, assembled to discuss serious subjects, can be nothing more than a quilting party or tattlers' club enlarged and let loose.

We have never seen a convention conducted with more decorum, or a greater degree of intelligent accord exhibited in the routine of proceedings, than was noticeable in this first annual gathering of the friends of suffrage in Iowa. A majority of the members were women. They opened the convention and conducted the discussions with a spirit-and in a manner after which men might well pattern. In some respects, the ladies who took the lead, showed themselves better posted in general information, in all matters of deliberation, than men.

We would not endorse all that was done at the convention, but we would be fair enough to give to it the meed of having been, in all respects, well conducted. The convention strengthened those in whose name it met, not only among themselves, but with the public. All who attended it were impressed with the conviction that its members were earnest and honest, and could see that they were intelligent and well armed. Whatever it may have done directly, and that we know was much, it accomplished more good for its cause by impressing the public mind that its adherents in Iowa are banded together in union, and bound to make every honorable effort for success.

In January, 1872, I received a letter from a very prominent member of the legislature, from which the following is an extract:

After consultation I believe the House would resolve itself into committee of the whole (when senators would be likely also to come in), and hear you on the question of woman suffrage. Should you desire to press it to vote this session, I should advise that course. As to the time of your hearing, it should be in the day, and appointed soon after the recess. We meet again on February 13. I think it could be arranged for Friday, the 16th, if agreeable to you. With kind regards, JOHN A. KASSON.

Notwithstanding this kind proposal of Mr. Kasson, I did not act upon his suggestion. But Mrs. Harbert and Mrs. Savery, feeling that something must be done, had the courage and the conscience, on their individual responsibility, to call a mass-meeting at the capitol on the evening previous to the day appointed for the vote on the amendment in the House. Mrs. Harbert presided and opened the meeting with an earnest appeal; Mrs. Savery, Mr. C. P. Holmes, Senator Converse, and Governor Carpenter, made eloquent speeches. The governor, in opening his address said he voted to strike "black" from the constitution sixteen years ago, and would then, as now, had the opportunity been presented, have voted to strike out "male."

On the following day when the amendment came up in the House for the final vote, it was carried by 58 to 39. In the Senate there was a spirited discussion, Hon. Charles Beardsley making an earnest speech in favor of the resolution. The vote on engrossing the bill for the third

Digitized by Google

reading stood 26 ayes to 20 nays. Hope ran high with the friends; but alas! on a final vote, taken but a few minutes later, the bill was lost by 24 nays to 22 ayes.* The general sentiment was well stated by the Iowa *State Register:*

The Senate disposed of the woman suffrage question yesterday by voting it down. We think it made a mistake. Certainly there was, at the lowest count, thirty out of every hundred voters in the State who desired to have this legislature ratify the action of the last Assembly, and submit the question at the polls this fall. The Republican party has its own record to meet here. The first time the negro suffrage question was submitted to the people of Iowa, it was submitted by a Republican legislature, and the submission was made when not over one voter in a hundred desired it done. This latter thing was a plain proposition, a most justly preferred petition. The people who were anxious to have the question submitted, are, it is confidently claimed, in majority. We think their wishes might well and fitly have been granted. Even those who were opposed to them must see that the advocates of the reform will now have a chance to claim that the opponents of it are afraid to go with them to the people. This is not merely a defeat for the present year, but practically for four years. Our State constitution can be amended only after two legislatures have acted upon the amendment, and the people have voted upon it. The legislature of two years ago passed the resolution voted down yesterday. Now, we presume, it will have to take another start. Four years of waiting and working before the friends of the reform can be given a chance to get a verdict from the people, is a long and painful ordeal. It will not be endured with patience. It would be asking too much of human nature to expect that.

At the annual convention of 1874, at Des Moines, Bishop Gilbert Haven of the Methodist Episcopal Church, a clear and liberal thinker, made a very impressive speech on the power woman could wield with the ballot in her own hand in making our towns and cities safe for our sons and daughters to live in. This year, the Des Moines annual conference of the M. E. Church passed resolutions advocating woman suffrage as a great moral reform; while the State convention of the Universalist Association in its resolution said: "This convention recognizes that women are entitled to all the social, religious, and political rights which men enjoy."

At the Diocesan Convention held at Davenport May 1881, the Episcopal Church took a step forward by striking the word male out of a canon, thus enabling women to vote for vestrymen, a right hitherto withheld. It is but a straw in the right direction, but "straws show which way the wind blows," and we may hope for more good things to follow.

The Republican party, in convention assembled, at Des Moines, July 1, 1874, inserted the following, as the tenth plank of its platform:

Resolved, That since the people may be entrusted with all questions of governmental reform, we favor the final submission to them of the question of amending the constitution so as to extend the right of suffrage to women, pursuant to the action of the fifteenth General Assembly.

---

* *Yeas*, Senators Beardsley, Bemis, Burke, Campbell, Chambers, Converse, Dague, Dashiell, Dysart, Howland, Hurley, Kephart, Maxwell, McCold, McKean, McNutt, Read, Shane, Smith, Vale, West, Young—22. *Nays*, Senators Allen, Boomer, Claussen, Crary, Fairall, Fitch, Gault, Havens, Ireland, Ketcham, Kinne, Larrabee, Leavitt, Lowry, McCollough, Merrill, Miles, Murray, Russell, Stone, Stewart, Taylor, Willett, Wonn—24. Senator Murray had voted in the affirmative in the first instance, but changed his vote in order to be able to move a reconsideration of the vote, by which the resolution was lost.

Digitized by Google

The reading of the resolution called forth cheers of approval, and was adopted without a dissenting vote. Mrs. Elizabeth Boynton Harbert is entitled to great credit for this "woman's plank," she having gone before the committee on resolutions and made an earnest appeal for woman's recognition by the Republican party. The *State Record* said:

When the Republicans, in national convention, recognized woman, and gave her a plank in the platform of the party, it reflected back a spirit of justice and progress which is looked for in vain in the party opposing, of whatever name. But when the Republicans of Iowa gave to a woman the privilege of bringing in a plank of her own production, and that plank was added to the State platform without a dissenting voice, it placed Iowa, men and women alike, in the vanguard of the world's onward march to a more rational life, more even justice, and purer government.

In the Republican State platform of Iowa is the first real and purely woman's plank that ever entered into any political platform—because it originated in the brain of woman. It was by a woman carried to the committee, and in response to an able, dignified, and true womanly appeal, it was accepted, and by the convention incorporated into the platform of the party. It may seem to be a small plank, but it has strength and durability. It is the live oak of a living principle, that will remain sound while other planks of greater bulk around it will have served their purpose and wasted away.

It argues thus: if woman is competent to present a political issue, clothed in her own language, with a dignity and modesty that silence opposition, is she not competent to exercise with prudence and intelligence the elective franchise? and would she not, if entrusted with it, exercise it for the elevation of a common humanity? The *Record* tenders hearty congratulations not only to Mrs. Harbert, who we know will bear the honors modestly, but also to those who by their presence in the convention gave encouragement to greater respect for woman's wishes, and by whose work is demonstrated woman's fitness to be in truth a helpmeet for man. We had a mother, and have sisters, wife, and daughter, and that is why we would have woman enjoy every privilege and opportunity to be useful to herself and her country that we claim for ourself.

At the annual meeting of 1875, held at Oskaloosa, the following letter from the governor of the State was received:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, Des Moines, Iowa.

Mrs. R. G. ORWIG, *Cor. Sec. I. W. S. S.—Dear Madam:* I have your letter inviting me to be present at your annual meeting. Thanking you and the association for the consideration implied, I have to express my regrets that business of an official character will prevent me from coming. I hope your proceedings may be characterized by such wisdom, moderation, and sincerity as to advance the cause to which your efforts are given. I have never been able to discover any argument to sustain my own right to vote that does not equally apply to woman. Whether my right is founded upon the interest I have, in common with my fellows, in the preservation of the free institutions of my country; or upon the protection of my personal interests as a citizen; or upon my right to a voice in the creation of laws to which I am held amenable; or upon my right to influence by a vote the direction given to revenues which I am taxed to help supply; or upon any other right, personal, political or moral, I have never been able to see why the reasons which make the vote valuable to me do not apply with equal force to woman. You doubtless think your efforts are comparatively fruitless; but I need not tell you that while your agitation has failed, so far, to bring you the ballot, it has ameliorated the condition of woman in very many particulars. Her property rights are better protected; her sphere of activity has been enlarged, and her influence for good is more widely recognized. So I wish you well. Yonrs truly,

C. C. CARPENTER.

This year women were members of a lay delegation in the Methodist conference, and also lay delegates to the Presbyterian synod. And in two or three instances women have been invited to address these bodies, and have received a vote of thanks. Many of the orthodox clergy are openly advocating our cause, and in some instances women have been invited by them to occupy their desks on Sunday to preach the Gospel to the people. This is a wonderful advance in sentiment since 1852, when in New York the clergy would not permit women to speak, even on temperance in a public hall.

In 1876 the society secured the services of Matilda Hindman, of Pittsburg, Pa., who traveled over the greater part of the State, lecturing and organizing societies, and was everywhere spoken of as an eloquent and logical speaker. She was followed by Margaret W. Campbell, and those who know her feel that the State gained in her a valuable friend in everything pertaining to the interests of woman. What is said of Miss Hindman as a speaker may also be said of Mrs. Campbell.

The first governor of Iowa to officially recognize woman's right to the ballot was the Hon. C. C. Carpenter, who in his message to the General Assembly of 1876, said:

> The proposed amendment to the constitution, adopted by your predecessors, and which requires your sanction before being submitted to the voters of the State, will come before you. I venture to suggest, that the uniform expression in Wyoming Territory, where woman suffrage is a fact, is favorable to its continuance, and that wherever in Europe and America women have voted for school or minor officers the influence of their suffrage has been beneficent; and in view of the peculiar appropriateness of submitting this question in this year, 1876, when all America is celebrating achievements which were inspired by the doctrine that taxation and representation are of right inseparable, it is recommended that you give the people of Iowa an opportunity to express their judgment upon the proposed amendment at the ballot-box.

At the request of the State Association, Miss Matilda Hindman was granted a hearing before the legislature, and most respectful attention was accorded to her able address. Miss Anthony was also invited, and, at the suggestion of Mrs. Savery, she engaged the opera-house. The seats reserved for the members were all filled, and every part of the house occupied. The day following, the vote in the House was taken, and carried by 54 to 40. After a careful canvass of the Senate, it was found that there were ten votes to spare; but alas! when the day for final action came the amendment was lost by one vote.*

---

* The names of the representatives voting on the Woman Suffrage amendment are as follows (Republicans in Roman, Democrats in Italics): YEAS—Allen, *Baker*, *Bolter*, Brooks, Brush, Calvin, Campbell, Case, Chapman, Clark of Johnson, Cleveland, Colvin, Craver, Deweese, Giltner, Given, Glendenning, Glover, Hall, Hoag, Homer, Horton, *Hotchkiss*, *Hunt*, Irwin of Warren, Jaqua, Jordan, Johnson of Benton, Kauffman, Lane, Lathrop, *Lynch*, McCartney, McHugh, McNeill, Madden of Polk, *Madison*, Maris, Mills, Moffit, Morse of Wright, Norris, Palmer, Preudfoot, Rae, Reed of Howard, Robinson, Said, Scott, Smith, Tice, Underwood, Ure, Wilson—54. NAYS—Auld, Benton, *Birchard*, *Brown*, Bush, *Christy*, *Clark* of Marion, *Crawford* of Dubuque, Danforth, *Dixon*, *Elliot*, Evans, Fuller, *Gibbons*, Gilliland, *Gray*, *Harned*, Hemenway, *Hobbs*, *Herstman*, *Johnston* of Dubuque, Johnson of Winneshiek, McCune, *Madden* of Taylor, Manning, *Mentzel*, Morse of Adams, *Mueller*, Reed of Jackson, Rees, Shaw, Simmons, Stone, Stuart, *Stuckey*, *Thayer*, *White*, Williams, *Young*, Mr. Speaker (John W. Gear)—40. ABSENT—Shepardson, Graves, Irwin of Lee, Seevers, McElderry, *Crawford* of Scott.

The vote in the Senate was: YEAS—Arnold, Bailey, Campbell, Conaway, Dashiell, Dwelle, Gallup, Gilmore, Graham, Harmon, Hersey, Jessup, McCoid, Miller of Appanoose, Miller of

Digitized by Google

In 1880 Senator Gaylord of Floyd county made a speech, giving twenty-one reasons why he voted against the submission of the proposition for the enfranchisement of women, which was published in full in the Des Moines *Register*, and thus sent broadcast over the State. Mrs. Bloomer replied to Mr. Floyd through the same paper, meeting and refuting every objection, thus in a measure antidoting the poisonous influence of the senator's pronunciamento.

In the spring of this year Dr. Harriette Bottsford and Mrs. Jane C. McKinney were appointed by a caucus of Republican women, to the Powesheik county convention, to choose delegates to the State convention. They presented their credentials to the committee, and the chairman reported them as delegates. On motion, they were accepted—but some men soon bethought them that this was establishing a bad precedent, and began maneuvering to get rid of them. This was finally done by declaring the delegation full without them—two men having been quietly appointed to fill vacancies after the ladies had presented their credentials. Mrs. McKinney made a spicy speech, saying they did not expect to be received as delegates, but wished to remind the men that women were citizens, tax-payers and Republicans, but unrepresented.

At the Greenback State convention of 1881, Mrs. Mary E. Nash was nominated as the candidate of that party for State superintendent of schools. Mrs. Nash declined the honor intended, and said that her political flag, if it were to float at all, would be found in another camp. She would not desert her colors for office. In 1884 Mrs. H. J. Bellangee and Mrs. A. M. Swain were regularly accredited delegates to the National Greenback convention, held at Indianapolis, Ind., to nominate a candidate for the presidency, where they were received with the greatest courtesy.

The annual meeting of 1882, at Des Moines, was remarkable for the number of clergymen, representing nearly all the different denominations, who took part in its proceedings, each of the nine seeming to vie with the others in expressing his belief that the ballot for woman, as for man, was a right, not a privilege. Bishop Hurst of the M. E. Church, made an able speech. The executive committee sent a memorial to the Republican convention, held in June for the nomination of State officers, asking a plank in their platform favoring the submission of the woman suffrage amendment. The request was not granted. Leading politicians who professed to believe in equality of rights for women feared that to do so would make too heavy a weight for the party to carry, it having already incorporated a prohibition plank in its platform. The committee also interviewed 500 editors, asking them to open the columns of their papers to the advocacy of woman suffrage. One hundred and twenty replied favorably, while many were courteous and others brusque in their refusals.

A committee on legislation (Mrs. Narcissa T. Bemis, chairman) did good

---

Blackhawk, Mitchell, Newton, Nichols, Perkins, Thornburg, Wood, Woolson—22. NAYS—Bestow, Carr, Clark, Cooley, Dows, Hartshorn, Hebard, *Kinne*, Larrabee, Lovell, *McCormack*, *Maginnis*, *Merrell* of Clinton, Merrill of Wapello, *Pease*, Rothert, Rumple, Teale, Willett, Williams, *Wilson*, *Wonn*, Wright—23. ABSENT—Hitchcock (who was sick and died in a few days), yea; *Murphy*, nay; Shane (resigned on account of being appointed district judge), yea; *Stoneham*, nay; Young, nay.

Digitized by Google

work during this session of the legislature, and also published a tract composed of contributions from twelve leading ministers of the State, called "The Clergymen's Tract." This was sent broadcast. Nine hundred of the clergy were favored with a copy. The Ministerial Association, held in Des Moines, passed the following:

Resolved, That we are heartily in favor of woman suffrage as advocated by your association, and regard the same as a proper subject for pulpit-teaching, and, as opportunity offers of furthering said cause in our pulpit ministry, we will avail ourselves of the same.

During this year the State Society contributed liberally to the Nebraska campaign. Mrs. Nancy R. Allen and Mrs. Mary B. Lee each left a small legacy to the association.

Of the annual meeting of 1883,* held at Ottumwa, the local papers gave full and fair reports; while 200 papers of the State published a condensed statement prepared by the secretary. Miss Hindman and Mrs. Campbell were again invited to the State. No grander work than theirs was ever done in Iowa. There is scarcely a county which they have not canvassed; holding meetings, forming associations, circulating petitions, distributing tracts, preaching on Sundays in the churches, traveling, often for months at a time, without a pledge of pecuniary aid, depending for their expenses wholly on funds contributed at their meetings.

The State convention of 1884 met at the Christian Church at Des Moines; Mrs. Nacissa T. Bemis presided. Mrs. Helen M. Gougar of Indiana was one of the speakers. A committee, of which Mrs. Martha C. Callanan was chairman, interviewed the governor, asking a recognition of woman's right of suffrage, and were told it should receive consideration. Accordingly, in his message to the legislature, Governor Sherman said:

Your attention is respectfully directed to the question of impartial suffrage, in respect to which the nineteenth General Assembly proposed an amendment to the constitution. Should this meet your approval, as preliminary to taking the judgment of the voters, I recommend that it be submitted at a special election, in order that it may be freed from the influence of partisan politics, and thus receive an unprejudiced vote of our citizens. Not caring to here express an opinion upon the question itself, it is sufficient to say that now, as heretofore, I am in favor of the submission of any question which is of importance and general interest.

Governor Sherman also gave it as his opinion that a good woman should be placed on the board of trustees of every public institution. This was the second time that an Iowa governor had referred to this great political question in his message to the General Assembly, Governor Carpenter having heartily indorsed the measure in 1876. It is said, however, that Governor Newbold had written a clause on the subject in his message in 1878, but that it was suppressed by the careful counsel of some guardian angel of his party.

Previous to the assembling of this legislature, petitions had been widely

* Narcissa T. Bemis of Independence was reëlected president, and Mary A. Work chairman of the executive committee, with headquarters at Des Moines; Mrs. Margaret W. Campbell was made State lecturer and organizer, and Mariana T. Folsom financial secretary of the association.

Digitized by Google

circulated,* praying for the submission of the amendment. Over 6,000 signatures were obtained. Each petition was placed in the hands of a senator or member from the county in which the names were gathered, for presentation in the respective Houses.

For fifteen consecutive years the State Society has met annually, made reports, passed resolutions, elected officers, listened to speeches and transacted what other business has come before it. Though its anniversaries have usually been held at Des Moines, its influence through the press has pervaded the whole State. Since 1875, the annual meetings have been held in different cities † outside the capital, thus giving the people of all sections of the State an opportunity to participate in the deliberations. Petitions to the legislature and to congress have been circulated by the society, delegates sent to the conventions of the National and American Suffrage Associations,‡ and letters addressed to the delegates of the State and National nominating conventions of the political parties, asking for a recognition of woman's right to the ballot in their platforms.

A brief recital of the proceedings of the Iowa legislature will show that a large majority of the Representatives have been in favor of submitting the question of woman suffrage to a direct vote of the men of the State. The proposition was first presented in the House by Hon. John P. Irish, in 1870. The resolution passed both Houses with very little debate, was approved by the governor, and submitted to the next General Assembly. In the session of 1872 it was discussed in both Houses at considerable length, and again passed in the Lower House by the strong vote of 58 ayes to 39 nays; while in the Senate it was lost by only two majority. The House has never failed at any session since that time, until 1884, to give a majority in its favor; but the Senate has not made for itself so good a record. In 1872 the vote in the Senate stood: ayes, 22; nays, 24. In 1876 it was lost by one vote; and in 1880 lost on engrossment. In 1884 the tables were turned; when the amendment came up in the twentieth General Assembly for ratification, the Senate passed the bill, while the House, for the first time, defeated it by a small majority.

---

* Mrs. M. A. Darwin, Mrs. Martha Callanan, Mrs. Judith Ellen Foster, superintendents of the franchise department of the W. C. T. U, of the State, rolled up petitions in their respective districts; and Mrs. Campbell and Miss Hindman aided largely in gathering the signatures.

† In August, 1875, at Oskaloosa; October, 1880, Fort Dodge; 1881, Marshalltown; 1883, Ottumwa; 1885, Cedar Rapids; all of the intervening anniversaries have been held at Des Moines. The presidents of the State society since its organization have been Attorney-General Henry O'Connor, Amelia Bloomer, Lizzie B. Read, Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Mrs. Dr. Porter, James Callanan, Martha C. Callanan, Mrs. Caroline A. Ingham, Narcissa T. Bemis, Margaret W. Campbell. When the society was organized, in 1870, it declared itself independent and remained thus until 1879, when, by a small vote, it was made auxiliary to the American Association. The officers for 1885 are: *President*, Mrs. M. W. Campbell, Des Moines; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Eliza H. Hunter, Des Moines; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. Jennie Wilson, Cedar Rapids; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Martha C. Callanan, Des Moines; *Executive Committee*, Mary J. Coggeshall, *Chairman;* R. Amanda Stewart, Harriet G. Bellanger, Des Moines; Orilla M. James, Knoxville; Florence English, Grinnell; Ellen Armstrong, Ottumwa; Narcissa T. Bemis, Independence; Angeline Allison, Cedar Rapids; Elizabeth P. Gue, Des Moines.

‡ At the State Fair held September, 1885, at Des Moines, the women had a very handsomely decorated booth where they received many hundred calls, distributed an immense amount of suffrage literature, obtained a thousand signatures to a petition to the legislature and wrote notes of the fair for various newspapers, in all of which woman suffrage was freely discussed.

Digitized by Google

By the constitution of Iowa an amendment must be approved by two consecutive legislatures, convened in regular session. When so approved it is then submitted to the popular vote of the electors. As in this State the legislature meets but once in two years, the reader can see how easily a bill passed at one session may, two years later, be defeated by the election of new members who are opposed to it. And thus through all these years those who claim the ballot for woman in this State have been elated or depressed by the action of each succeeding legislature.

The thirteenth General Assembly not only earned a good name for enlightened statesmanship by passing the constitutional amendment in favor of woman suffrage, but it also, by chapter 21, approved March 8, 1870, passed an act admitting women to the practice of law. It was under this that Judith Ellen Foster—so widely known as an eloquent lecturer and able lawyer—Annie C. Savery, Mrs. Emma Haddock, Louisa H. Albert, Jessie M. Johnson, and several others have passed the necessary examination and been admitted to practice as attorneys and counselors in all the courts of the State. Mrs. Arabella Mansfield was admitted to the bar in 1869, just a year previous to the enactment of the law.

Miss Linda M. Ramsey, now Mrs. Hartzell, was employed as a clerk by Adjutant-General Baker in 1864, and held the office for some time after the war closed. The *Record* says she was the first woman regularly employed and paid by the State for clerical services. Miss Augusta Matthews served as military secretary for Governor Stone during the war under pay of the State.

It was the thirteenth General Assembly, 1870, that first elected a woman, Miss Mary E. Spencer, to the office of engrossing clerk; and upon her it devolved to convey the message from the House to the Senate, announcing the passage of the woman suffrage amendment. In 1872 each House elected one woman among its officers; and each succeeding General Assembly since that time has elected from three to six women. The office of postmaster has been filled by women for the last ten years, and is now held by the venerable widow of General N. A. Baker, for many years the popular adjutant-general of the State. The office of State librarian was filled by Mrs. Ada North for seven years, and is now held by Mrs. S. B. Maxwell. Mrs. North is (1885) librarian of the State University at Iowa City.

The State insane hospitals are inspected by a visiting commission, one of whom is a woman. Several of the city hospitals are managed by women of the Catholic orders. The reform schools have a woman on their board of trustees, of whom Governor Sherman was graciously pleased to say that "she discovered more of the true inwardness of the institution in three days than her honorable colleague had done in three years."

In 1876 Governor Kirkwood appointed Mrs. Nancy R. Allen notary public. He also appointed Mrs. Merrill as teacher and chaplain at the State penitentiary, Miss McCowen as physician of the State insane asylum, and Dr. Sara A. Pangborn, one of the staff of physicians of the insane hospital at Independence.

Digitized by Google

In 1874 Governor Carpenter appointed Mrs. Deborah Cattell a commissioner to investigate the alleged cruelty in the State Reform School at Eldora; and for this service she was paid the same as men who served on the same commission. Governor Gear appointed Dr. Abbie M. Cleaves delegate from Iowa to the National Conference of Charities and Correction, and to the National Association for the Protection of the Insane and the Prevention of Insanity, which was held in Cleveland, Ohio, July, 1880. Mrs. Mary Wright and Dr. Abbie Cleaves were commissioned to the conference of the same associations at Louisville, Ky., in 1883. The legislature of 1880 appointed Jane C. McKinney one of the trustees of the Hospital for the Insane, at Independence.

The eighteenth General Assembly, 1880, passed an act to extend to women the right to hold the office of county recorder. A bill giving them the right to hold the office of county auditor passed the House, but was lost in the Senate. Under the above law Miss Addie Hayden was elected recorder of Warren county by a majority of 397 votes. She ran on an independent ticket. Mrs. C. J. Hill was chosen recorder of Osceola county at the same election.

The instruction of the youth of Iowa has fallen largely into the hands of women. During the year 1879 the number of women employed as teachers was 13,579, while the number of men was 7,573. In the larger towns and cities women are almost exclusively engaged as teachers. Miss Phebe Ludlow, after having for several years acceptably discharged the duties of city superintendent of schools at Davenport, was elected professor of English language and literature in the State University at Iowa City. The chair is still occupied by a woman, as is that of instructor of mathematics and several other branches in that institution, which, to the honor of Iowa be it said, always opened its doors to both sexes alike.

The question of the eligibility of women to the office of county superintendent of public schools having arisen by the election of Miss Julia C. Addington in the autumn of 1869, the matter was referred to the attorney-general by the State superintendent of public instruction, and the following was his reply:

Hon. A. S. Kissell, Superintendent of Public Instruction:

DEAR SIR: Rights and privileges of persons (citizens) are frequently extended but never abridged by implication. The soundness and wisdom of this rule of construction is, I believe, universally conceded. Two clauses of the constitution, only, contain express provisions excluding women from the rights and privileges in said provisions. Section 1, of Article I., as to the right of suffrage, and Section 4, of Article III., which provides that members of the legislature must be free white male citizens. "Free" and "white" have lost their meaning (if the words in that use ever had any suitable or good meaning), but the word "male" still retains its full force and effect. If this express restriction exists in the constitution as to any other office, it has escaped my notice. It is true that the words "person" and "citizen" frequently occur in other parts of the constitution in connection with eligibility and qualification for office, and I fully admit that by usage—"time-honored usage," if you will—these phrases have in common acceptation been taken to mean man in the masculine gender only, and to exclude woman. But a recent decision in the Court Exchequer, England, holding that the generic term "man" includes woman also, indicates our progress from a crude barbarism to a better civilization.

The office of county superintendent was created by chapter 52 of the acts of the seventh General Assembly, laws of 1868, pages 52–72. Neither in that act, nor in any subsequent legislation on the subject, have I been able to find any express provisions making male citizenship a test of eligibility for the place, or excluding women; and when I look over the duties to be performed by that officer—as I have with some care, and, I trust, not without interest—I deem it exceedingly fortunate for the cause of education in Iowa that there is no provision in the law preventing women from holding the office of county superintendent of common schools. I know that the pronoun "he" is frequently used in different sections of the act, and referring to the officer; but, as stated above, this privilege of the citizen cannot be taken away or denied by intendment or implication; and women are citizens as well and as much as men.

I need scarcely add that, in my opinion, Miss Addington is eligible to the office to which she has been elected; that she will be entitled to her pay when she qualifies and discharges the duties of the office, and that her decisions on appeal, as well as all her official acts, will be legal and binding. It is perhaps proper to state that an opinion on this question, substantially in agreement with the present one, was sent from this office to a gentleman writing from Osage, in Mitchell county, several weeks ago, which for some reason unknown to me, seems not to have been made public in the county. I have the honor to be, etc., HENRY O'CONNOR, *Attorney-General.*

Miss Addington, in her short letter of inquiry to the superintendent, has the following modest conclusion: "The position is not one I should have chosen for myself, but since my friends have shown so much confidence in me, and many of them are desirous that I should accept the office, I feel inclined to gratify them, if it be found there is nothing incompatible in my doing so."

The question of the eligibility of women to hold school offices was again raised at the October election of 1875. Miss Elizabeth S. Cooke was elected to the office of superintendent of common schools in Warren county. The question of her right to hold the office was carried by her opponent, Mr. Huff, to the District Court of that county, by appeal; and that court decided that the defendant, Miss Cooke, "being a woman, was ineligible to the office." It was then carried to the Supreme Court of the State, which held that "there is no constitutional inhibition upon the rights of women to hold the office of county superintendent." In the meantime, however, and immediately following the decision of the Warren county judge, the General Assembly, March 2, 1876, promptly came to the rescue and passed the following act, almost unanimously:

SECTION 1. No person shall be deemed ineligible, by reason of sex, to any school office in the State of Iowa.

SEC. 2. No person who may have been, or shall be, elected or appointed to the office of county superintendent of common schools, or director, in the State of Iowa, shall be deprived of office by reason of sex.

Under the provisions of this law, and the above-cited decision of the Supreme Court, Miss Cooke was allowed to serve out her term of office without hindrance. Since that time women have been elected, and discharged the duties of county superintendent with great credit to themselves and advantage to the public. Women have also been elected to other school offices in different parts of the State. Mrs. Mary A. Work was unanimously elected sub-director in district No. 6, Delaware township, Polk county, in the spring of 1880; and soon after was made presi-

Digitized by Google

dent of the board—the first woman, so far as known, to fill the position of president of a school board.

In 1877, in Frederica, Bremer county, Mrs. Mary Fisher attended the school meeting, and was elected as one of the three directors. The two others were men, one of whom immediately resigned, saying he would not hold office with a woman. His resignation was at once accepted. He further remarked that "woman's place was *to hum;* she was out of her *spear* to school *meetin's, holdin'* office," etc. Mrs. Fisher had been a teacher for six years. Mrs. Shirley, another successful teacher, accompanied Mrs. Fisher to the next school meeting, and both ladies voted on all questions that came up for action, and nothing was said against their doing so.

This year (1885) the school board of Des Moines elected Mrs. Lou. M. Wilson to the office of city superintendent of public schools, with a salary of $1,800 a year. She has in charge eighty teachers, among whom are two men in the position of principals. At the woman's congress, held at Des Moines in October, 1885, Dr. Jennie McCowen, in her report for this State, said:

An increasing number of women have been elected on school-boards, and are serving as officers and county superintendents of schools. Last year six women served as presidents, thirty-five as secretaries, and fifty as treasurers of school-boards. Of the superintendents and principals of graded schools about one in five is a woman; of county superintendents, one in nine; of teachers in normal institutes, one in three; of principals of secondary institutions of learning, one in three; of tutors and instructors in colleges, one in two; and in the twenty-three higher institutions of learning, thirteen young women are officiating as professors, and in three of these colleges the secretary of the faculty is a woman. The State board of examiners has one woman—Miss Ella A. Hamilton of Des Moines—and the State superintendent of public instruction has for a number of years availed himself of the valued services of a woman for private secretary. The *Northwestern Educational Journal* is edited by a woman. At the last meeting of the State Teachers' Association a committee was appointed to prepare a regular course of reading for teachers. This course is mainly professional and literary, with a leaning toward the latter. A large number of these reading circles have already been organized, and much interest, and even enthusiasm, is being manifested by teachers in all parts of the State. The school of Domestic Economy, in connection with the Agricultural College, is in charge of a woman as dean, and, although but a year old, has made an auspicious beginning. A number of young ladies, graduates of the State University and other literary schools, have gone to the School of Domestic Economy to finish their education.

Iowa has many women engaged as journalists. Prominent among these is Miss Maggie VanPelt, city editor of the Dubuque *Times*. She conducts her department very ably, and acceptably to her readers. Whether an advocate for suffrage or not, she is certainly a practical woman's rights woman. Independent and fearless, she goes about day and night where she pleases, and wherever her business calls her. A revolver, which she is known to carry, makes it safe for her to walk the street at all hours. Mrs. Will Hollingsworth, of the Sigourney *Review*, does a large part of the writing for that paper, and assists in the management of the establishment. *Woman's Hour*, edited by Mary J. Coggeshall, was published by women at Des Moines two seasons, during the exposition. Ten thousand copies were printed for free distribution, and a hand-

Digitized by Google

somely decorated department granted the society in the exposition for their work. Mrs. E. H. Hunter and Mrs. Woods represented the society. Mrs. Pauline Swaim is noted for her journalistic ability. Besides working on her husband's paper, the Oskaloosa *Herald*, she has done much for the *State Register*, reporting for it the proceedings of the Senate. In October, 1875, Nettie Sanford started a paper at Marshalltown, called *The Woman's Bureau*, which she published for two years. During 1878 she published the *San Gabriel Valley News*, in California. Mrs. L. M. Latham for many years conducted a suffrage column in the Cedar Rapids *Times*; since 1884 she has been associated with Mrs. J. L. Wilson on the *Transcript*, an eight column paper devoted to general news, temperance and woman suffrage. The paper is owned by Mrs. Wilson. Mrs. Nettie P. Fox edits the *Spiritual Offering* at Ottumwa; Mrs. Hattie Campbell, a suffrage department in *The Advance*, at Des Moines; Mary Osborne edits the *Osceola Sentinel*, and is superintendent of the public schools of Clark county; Mrs. Lafayette Young is engaged on the *Atlantic Telegraph*. Very many papers in the State have women in charge of one or more columns.

In the humbler walks of literature Iowa can boast quite a number of women who have made successful attempts at authorship.* In sculpture Mrs. Harriet A. Ketcham, of Mt. Pleasant, deserves mention. She has the exclusive contract to model the prominent men of Iowa for the new capitol. Mrs. Estelle E. Vore, Mrs. Cora R. Fracker, and Miss Emma G. Holt, are known as musical composers.

Among the lecturers of Iowa, Mrs. Matilda Fletcher is worthy of mention. Though she has never made woman suffrage a specialty, she is sound on that question, and frequently introduces it incidentally in her lectures. In 1869 she was living in obscurity in Council Bluffs, her husband being employed as a teacher in one of the suburban schools. Young, girlish-looking, no one seeing her would have dreamed of her possessing the capabilities she has since displayed. She started out under many discouragements, but has shown a perseverance, a self-reliance, and an indomitable will that few women manifest in the same direction. Mrs. Fletcher has been employed by the Republican party during some of the most important and exciting campaigns, speaking throughout the State, in halls, tents, and in the open air. Every such effort on the part of woman is an advantage to the cause we advocate, bringing it nearer to final success. But it is to Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony, Anna Dickinson, Mrs. Livermore, and other lyceum lecturers † that our State is especially indebted for a knowledge of the true principles upon which

* In literature there is "Europe through a Woman's Eye," by Mrs. Cutler of Burlington; "The Waverly Dictionary," by Miss May Rogers, Dubuque; "Common-School Compendium," by Mrs. Lamphere, Des Moines; "Hospital Life," by Mrs. Sarah Young, Des Moines; "Wee Folks of No Man's Land," by Mrs. Wetmore, Dubuque; "Two of Us," by Calista Patchin, Des Moines; "For Girls," by Mrs. E. R. Shepherd, Marshalltown; "Autumn Leaves," by Mrs. Scott, Greencastle; "Phonetic Pronunciation," by Mrs. Henderson, Salem; "Her Lovers," by Miss Claggett, Keokuk; "Practical Ethics," by Matilda Fletcher. There are several writers of cook-books, of medical and sanitary papers, of poems, of legal papers and of musical compositions. Miss Adeline M. Payne of Nevada has compiled catalogues of stock.

† Miss Anthony has given her lecture, entitled "Woman Wants Bread, not the Ballot," in over one hundred of the cities and villages of the State; and Mrs. Stanton and the others have doubtless lectured in fully as many places.

Digitized by Google

woman founds her claim to equal civil and political rights with man. In all sections of our land their voices have been heard by interested and delighted audiences.

There are about one hnndred and fifty women in the medical profession in the different cities of the State. Mrs. Yeomans, of Clinton, is a successful practitioner. Mrs. King, allopathist, and Mrs. Hortz, homeopathist, are regular graduates in good practice at Des Moines. Dr. Harding, electrician, and Dr. Hilton, allopathist, also graduates, have all the practice they can attend to in Council Bluffs. In 1883, Dr. Jennie McCowen was elected president of the Scott County Medical Society. This was the first time a woman was ever elected to that office in this State, if not in the United States.

It is quite sure that Iowa may justly claim the first woman in the profession of dentistry—Mrs. Lucy B. Hobbs, as early as 1863.* At Cresco there is the firm of Dr. L. F. & Mrs. M. E. Abbott, dental surgeons. At Mt. Pleasant, Mrs. M. E. Hildreth is a licensed dentist in successful practice.

Rev. Augusta Chapin was, I think, the first woman to enter the sacred office in this State. Miss Safford, Algona; Mrs. Gillette, Knoxville; Mrs. M. A. Folsom, Marshalltown; Florence E. Kollock, Waverly; Mrs. M. J. Janes, Spencer; Mrs. Hartsough, Ft. Dodge, are regularly ordained preachers of the Universalist and Unitarian faiths. There are several licensed preachers of the M. E. Church, but none have received regular ordination.

Iowa furnished the following women who went to the front as nurses during the war: Mrs. Harlan, wife of Senator Harlan; Mrs. Almira Fales, Mrs. Anne Wittenmeyer, Miss Phebe Allen, Mrs. Jerusha R. Small, Miss Melcena Elliott, Mrs. Arabella Tannehill. These all did good service in hospital and on the field, and some of them laid down their lives as a sacrifice. We copy the following as one of the many facts of the war:

Some years ago Adjutant-General Baker of Des Moines received a letter of inquiry asking about a certain soldier in the Twenty-fourth Iowa infantry. The tone of the letter was so peculiar as to attract considerable attention and create much comment in the office. In reply the general stated that the records of the regiment and the record of the soldier (whom, for the sake of convenience, we will call Smith, although that is far from the real name) were in his office. A few days afterwards a gentleman from Northern Iowa appeared, inquired for General Baker, and was closeted with him long enough to divulge the following singular tale:

When the war broke out Miss Mary Smith, daughter of the general's visitor, was residing in Ohio, working for a farmer. Her father's family had moved to Iowa the fall preceding the attack on Sumter, leaving Mary behind to follow in the spring. Various causes conspired to delay her departure for her Iowa home until autumn, and it was September before she landed at Muscatine, from which place she expected to travel by land to her father's house. She was a large-sized, hearty-looking girl, eighteen years of age. Arriving at Muscatine, some strange freak induced her to assume man's apparel and enlist in the Twenty-fourth infantry, then in rendezvous at that city. She did this without exciting any suspicion, burned all her feminine garments and papers, neglected to inform her friends of her arrival, and became a soldier. Some comment was elicited by her beardless face and girlish appearance, but as

* See New York chapter, page 401.

Digitized by Google

she did her duty promptly and was particularly handy in cooking and taking care of the sick, the young warrior speedily became a general favorite alike with officers and men.

She passed through all the campaigns in which the regiment was engaged without a scratch, except a close call from a minie ball at Sabine's Cross Roads, which took the skin off the back of her left hand, voted with the other members of the regiment for president in 1864, and was finally mustered out with her comrades at the close of the war. When she was discharged she procured female apparel—although in doing so she was obliged to make a confidant of one of her own sex—and procured work in Illinois, not far from Rock Island. Six months elapsed before the tan of five summers wore off, and when she had again become "white," and had re-learned the almost forgotten customs of womanhood, she presented herself at her father's house, where she was received with open arms.

To all the questions which were asked by the various members of the family she replied that she had been honestly employed, and had never forsaken the right way. She had been economical in the army, and invested several hundred dollars in land in Northern Iowa, which rapidly appreciated in value, and to-day she is well off. With the remainder of her money she attended school. Last January a worthy man, who had been in the same regiment, but in a different company, made her an offer of marriage. Like a true woman she was unwilling to bestow her hand when any part of her former life was unknown, and before accepting the offer she made to him a full revelation of her soldier-days. At first he could not believe it, but when she proceeded to narrate events and incidents which could be known only to active participants in them, told of marches, camps, skirmishes, battles, and the thousand and one things which never appear in print, but which ever remain living pictures with "old soldiers," he was obliged to accept the strange tale as true. The story, however, did not lessen his regard for her, and about the first of February they were married.

The lady's father, after hearing the tale of her life, was still incredulous, and only satisfied himself of its truth by a visit to the adjutant-general's office and an inspection of the records. By comparing dates furnished him by his daughter with the original rolls there on file he became fully convinced that it was all true.

A few of the inventions patented by women of Iowa are the following:

Fly-screen door-attachment, by Phœbe R. Lamborne, West Liberty; photograph-album, Viola J. Angie, Spencer; step-ladder, Mrs. Mary J. Gartrell, Des Moines; baking-powder can with measure combined, Mrs. Lillie Raymond, Osceola; egg-stand, Mrs. M. E. Tisdale, Cedar Rapids; egg-beater, and self-feeding griddle-greaser, Mrs. Eugenia Kilborn, Cedar Rapids; tooth-pick holder, Mrs. Ayers, Clinton; thermometer to regulate oven heat, Mrs. F. Grace, Perry; the excelsior ironing-table, Mrs. S. L. Avery, Marion; neck-yoke and pole-attachment, by which horses can be instantly detached from the vehicle, Maria Dunham, Dunlap; invalid bed, Mrs. Anna P. Forbes, Dubuque.

In the various business avocations I find the following:

Mrs. T. Nodles is the largest fancy grocer In the State, doing a yearly business of $80,000. Mrs. C. F. Barron, Cedar Rapids, designs and manufactures perforated embroidery patterns. Statistics show there are nine hundred and fifty-five Iowa women who own and direct farms; eighteen manage farms; six own and direct stock-farms; twenty manage dairy-farms; five own green-houses; nine manage market-gardens; thirty-seven manage high institutions of learntng; one hundred and twenty-five are physicians; five attorneys-at-law; ten ministers; three dentists; one hundred and ten professional nurses, and one civil engineer.

In the summer of 1884, the Fort Dodge *Messenger* had this paragraph about a Des Moines family:

Miss Kate Tupper, of Des Moines, has been in town, visiting at Mr. Bassett's for a few days. Kate comes of a family which is remarkable for intelligent womanly effort and success. Her mother is Mrs. Ellen S. Tupper, the Bee-queen of Iowa,

Digitized by Google

whose work on bee-culture is a recognized authority everywhere; her eldest sister is a very eloquent preacher at Colorado Springs; Miss Kate is studying medicine, having taken herself through a full course at the Agricultural College by her own work; and Miss Madge, who is only sixteen, is a famous poultry raiser, and an officer of the State Poultry Association, who has made money enough in this business to defray her entire expenses through a full collegiate course. Mrs. Tupper's family is a sufficient answer to the question of woman's work, if there were no other. Let any mother in Iowa show three boys who can beat this.

In this year Mrs. Louisa B. Stevens was elected president of the First National Bank at Marion, Linn county. The important position women are taking in the business world is illustrated by the presence of two delegates at the meeting of the American Street Railway Association held in St. Louis in the autumn of 1885—Mrs. L. V. Gredenburg, proprietor and treasurer of the New Albany Street Railway of New Albany, Ind., and Mrs. M. A. Turner, secretary and treasurer of the Des Moines Railway, Des Moines, Ia. One of the gentlemen expressed the belief that fully $25,000,000 of street-railway stock in this country is owned by women.

As to the distribution of the cardinal virtues between men and women it is generally claimed that the former possess courage, the latter fortitude. Although the pages of history are gilded with innumerable instances of the remarkable courage of women of all ages and conditions, and oftimes dimmed with the records of cowardice in men of all classes, yet what has been said for generations will probably be repeated, even in the face of so remarkable a fact as the following:

On March 1, 1882, the Iowa House of Representatives, on motion of Hon. A. J. Holmes, suspended the rules and passed a bill introduced by that gentleman providing for the presentation of a gold medal and the thanks of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa to Miss Kate Shelly, to which was added a money appropriation of two hundred dollars, which passed both Houses and became a law.

In support of the bill, Mr. Holmes spoke as follows:

Mr. Speaker: No apology is required for the introduction of this bill, and I shall make no explanation in regard to it, save a brief *résumé* of the facts upon which the bill is based. Miss Kate Shelly, with her widowed mother and little sisters and brother, lives in a humble home on the hill-side, in a rugged country skirting the Des Moines River. Her father had died years ago in the service of the great railway company whose line for some distance is overlooked by her home, while her mother, by economy, severe toil, and the assistance of Kate, was able to support her little family.

On the night of July 6, 1881, about 8 o'clock, there commenced one of the most memorable storms that ever visited Central Iowa; nothing like it had ever been witnessed by the oldest inhabitants. The Des Moines river rose over six feet in one hour —little rills that were dry almost the year round, suddenly developed into minature rivers—massive railway bridges and lines of track were swept away as if they had been cobwebs. It was while looking out of her window toward the high railroad bridge over Honey creek, that Kate Shelley saw the advancing head-light of a locomotive descend into an abyss and become extinguished, carrying with it the light of two lives. It was then she realized in all its force that a terrible catastrophe had occurred, and another more terrible, if not averted, would soon follow to the east-bound express train, heavily laden with passengers from the Pacific. She announced to her mother, sisters and brother, that she must go to the scene of the accident, and render assistance if possible, and also warn the oncoming passenger train.

It was in vain they tried to dissuade her. Although she was obliged to almost improvise a lantern in many of its parts, it was but a few minutes before she was ready to set out. Realizing then that her mission was one of peril, and that she might not

Digitized by Google

again look upon those dear faces, she kissed each of them affectionately, and amid their sobs, hurried out into the gloom, into the descending floods, toward the rushing torrents—drenched to the skin, on she passed toward the railroad to the well remembered foot-log, only to find the waters rushing along high above and beyond the place where it had been. Then she thought of the great bluff rising to the west of her home and extending southward toward the railroad track, and she determined to ascend it and reach the bridge over this barrier to the waters. Need I recount how she struggled on and up through the thick oak undergrowth, that, being storm-laden drooped and made more difficult her passage; how with clothing torn, and hands and face bleeding she arrived at the end of the bridge, and standing out upon the last tie she peered down into the abyss of waters with her dim light, and called to know if any one was there alive. In answer to her repeated calls came the answer of the engineer, who had caught hold of and made a lodgment in a tree-top, and around whom the waters were still rapidly rising, sending floating logs, trees, and driftwood against his frail support, and threatening momentarily to dislodge and engulf him.

It took but a moment to be assured that he was the survivor of four men who went down with the engine, and after a moment's hurried consultation, she started for Moingona, a mile distant, to secure assistance and to warn the eastward-bound passenger train then nearly due. As she passed along the high grade it seemed as if she must be blown over the embankment, and still the heavens seemed to give not rain but a deluge. As she approached the railway bridge over the Des Moines river the light in her lantern, her only guide and protection, went out. It was then that the heroic soul of this child of only sixteen years became most fully apparent; facing the storm which almost took away her breath, and enveloped in darkness that rendered every object in nature invisible, she felt her way to the railroad bridge. Here she must pass for a distance of four or five hundred feet over the rushing river beneath on the naked ties. As the wind swept the bridge she felt how unsafe it would be to attempt walking over it, and getting down upon her hands and knees, clutching the timbers with an almost despairing energy, she painfully and at length successfully made the passage. She reached the station, and having told of the catastrophe at the bridge, and requested the stoppage of the passenger train then about due, she fainted and fell upon the platform. This very briefly, wanting in much that is meritorious in it, is the story of Kate Shelly and the 6th of July. Her parents were countrymen of Sarsfield, of Emmett, and O'Connell—of the land that has given heroes to every other and dishonored none. It was an act well worthy to rank her with that other heorine, who, launching her frail craft from the long stone pier, braved the terrible seas on that Northumberland coast to save the lives of others at the risk of her own.

Mr. Holmes then produced a copy of the *State Register*, and requested the clerk to read the article therein contained, giving the details of the heroic girl's action, written at the time of its occurrence, and after the clerk had read the article, concluded by saying: "I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill may pass, believing that it is right, and further believing that the State of Iowa will do itself as much honor as the young lady named in the bill, in thus recognizing the greatest debt in our power to pay—that to humanity." Mr. Pickler moved to amend by instructing the gentleman from Boone (Mr. Holmes) to make the presentation. Carried, and the bill was amended accordingly, as above. On motion of Mr. Holmes, the rules were suspended, and the bill passed by a vote of 90 to 1. The governor of the State, Hon. A. J. Holmes, and Hon. J. D. Gillett were authorized to procure a medal of design and inscription to be approved by them, and present the same to the donee with the thanks of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa.

The medal, which is of elegant design and workmanship, was executed by Messrs Tiffany & Co., of New York, and was presented to Miss Shelly during the holidays of 1883. It is round in form, about three inches in diameter and weighs four ounces five and a half pennyweights. On both sides it is sunken below the circular edges and the figures and decorations are then displayed in bold relief. On the face is a

Digitized by Google

figure emblematic of Kate Shelly's daring exploit. It represents a young girl with a lantern in her left hand and her right thrown far out in warning, her hair streaming in the wind and her wet drapery clinging to her form, making her way over the ties of a high railroad bridge, in storm and tempest, with the lightning playing about her. In a semi-circle over the figure are the words: "Heroism, Youth, Humanity." On the reverse is the following inscription:

"Presented by the State of Iowa to Kate Shelly, with the thanks of the General Assembly, in recognition of the courage and devotion of a child of fifteen years, whom neither the terror of the elements nor the fear of death could appal in her efforts to save human life during the terrible storm and flood in the Des Moines valley on the night of July 6, 1881."

Surrounding the inscription is a wreath of leaves and beneath it the great seal of Iowa.

The presentation was made at Ogden in the presence of 3,000 people. It was given in the name of the State of Iowa by Mr. Welker Given, secretary to Governor Sherman, July 4, 1884, who represented the governor in his necessary absence. Hon. J. A. T. Hull, Secretary of State, introduced Miss Shelly and recounted her heroic deed of that fearful night, after which Mr. Given made the presentation speech. The response on behalf of Miss Shelly was made by Professor J. D. Curran, an old friend and teacher.

All very well, but how much better to have placed Kate Shelly (bearing the name of one of England's great poets) in the University at Des Moines, and given her a thorough education, from the primary through the whole collegiate course, and the school for law, medicine, or theology. A girl capable of such heroism and self-sacrifice must possess capacities and powers worthy the highest opportunities for development. Kate Shelly, with the scientific training of a civil engineer, might shed far more honor on her native State than sitting in ignorance and poverty on the banks of the Des Moines river with a gold medal round her neck.

The Patrons of Husbandry, having at one time as many as 1,998 Granges in the State, admit women to equal membership and equal rights. They have the same privileges in debate as men, and an equal vote in all matters concerning the Grange. The Grangers do not seem to fear that the children will suffer, or home interests be neglected, on account of this liberty given to women. Miss Garretson is State agent and lecturer for this order, and has accomplished much good by her labors among the people of the rural districts. She claims equal rights for woman even to the ballot. The Independent Order of Good Templars passed resolutions unqualifiedly committing the grand lodge of the State in favor of granting suffrage to woman, and pledging themselves to labor for the furtherance of that object. Temperance women who have heretofore opposed the enfranchisement of their sex, and objected to mixing the two questions, are coming to see that a powerless, disfranchised class can do little toward removing the great evil that is filling the land with pauperism and crime, and sending sixty thousand victims annually to a drunkard's grave. They have prayed and plead with the liquor-seller; they have petitioned electors and law-makers, but all in vain; and now they begin to see that work must accompany prayer, and that if they would save their sons from destruction they must strike a blow in their defense that will be felt by the enemy. Hence the Christian Temperance Union, which at the outset declared itself opposed to woman suffrage, has now

Digitized by Google

resolved in favor of that measure as a necessity for the furtherance of their cause.

On March 31, 1880, Judith Ellen Foster, of Clinton, made an able and eloquent argument before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, at Washington, on Senator Logan's proposition to constitute the revenue on alcoholic liquors a national educational fund. At a meeting of the State Union held in 1883, resolutions were passed, declaring woman's efforts in temperance of no avail, until with ballots in their own hands, they could coin their ideas and sympathies into law, and that henceforward they would labor to secure that power, that would speedily make their prayers and tears of some avail. This action gave a new impetus to the suffrage movement. At the State convention, Mrs. Jane Amy M'Kinney was appointed Superintendent of Franchise. Circulars were issued advising the Unions to make suffrage a part of their local work, and the advice was promptly followed in many sections of the State. At the election on the prohibitory amendment, June 29, 1882, women rallied at the polls, and furnished tickets to all whom they could persuade to take them, and this helped to roll up a large vote in favor of the amendment.

The laws of Iowa have been comparatively liberal to woman, and with each successive codification have been somewhat improved. By the code of 1857, the old right of dower, or life interest in one-third of the real estate of a deceased husband, was made an absolute interest; and this is the law at the present time. Of the personal property, the wife takes one-third if there are children, and one-half if there are no children to inherit. The same rule applies to the husband of a deceased wife. The codes of 1857 and 1860 each provided that the husband could not remove the wife, nor their children, from their homestead without the consent of the wife; and the code of 1875, now in force, changed this only so as to provide that neither shall the wife remove the husband without his consent. Deeds of real estate must be signed by both husband and wife, but no private examination of either has ever been required in Iowa. A husband and wife may deed property directly to each other.

By the code of 1851 the personal property of the wife did not vest at once in the husband, but if left within his control it became liable for his debts, unless she filed a notice with the recorder of deeds, setting forth her claim to the property, with an exact description. And the same rule applied to specific articles of personal property. Married women abandoned by their husbands could be authorized, on proper application to the District Court, to transact business in their own name. The same provisions were substantially reënacted in the code of 1860. Under both codes the husband was entitled to the wages and earnings of his wife, and could sue for them in the courts.

But the code of 1873 made a great advance in recognizing the rights of married women; and it is said the revisers sought, as far as possible, to place the husband and wife on an entire equality as to property rights. By its provisions, a married woman may own, in her own right, real and personal property acquired by descent, gift or purchase; and she may manage, sell, convey, and devise the same by will, to the same extent,

Digitized by Google

and in the same manner, that the husband can property belonging to him. And this provision is followed by others which fully confer on the married woman the control of her own property. Among other things it is enacted, that a wife may receive the wages of her personal labor, and maintain an action therefor in her own name, and hold the same in her own right; and she may prosecute and defend all actions at law, or in equity, for the preservation and protection of her rights and property. Contracts may be made by a wife, and liabilities incurred, and the same may be enforced by, or against her, to the same extent as though she were unmarried. The property of both husband and wife is equally liable for the expenses of the family and the education of their children, and neither is liable for the debts of the other contracted before marriage. By the code of 1873, now in force, it is declared that the parents are the natural guardians of their children, and are equally entitled to their care and custody; and either parent dying before the other, the survivor becomes the guardian.

But notwithstanding the seemingly equal provisions of our code, there is still a great disparity in the laws relating to the joint property of husband and wife—or property accumulated during marriage by their joint earnings and savings. Such property, whether real or personal, is generally held in the name of the husband—no matter how much his wife may have helped to accumulate it. If the wife dies, the husband still holds it all, and neither law nor lawyers can molest him, or question his right to it. But if the husband dies, the case is very different. Instead of being left in quiet possession of what is rightfully her own, to use and guard with all a mother's care and watchfulness for the benefit of her children, the law comes in and claims the right to appoint administrators and guardians—to require bonds and a strict accountability from her, and to set off to her a certain share of what should be as wholly hers as it is the husband's when the wife dies.

This is the old common law, that has come down to us from barbarous times, and the light of the nineteenth century has not yet been sufficient to so illumine the minds of Iowa legislators as to enable them to render exact justice to woman.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XLVI.

WISCONSIN.

Progressive Legislation—The Rights of Married Women—The Constitution Shows Four Classes Having the Right to Vote—Woman Suffrage Agitation—C. L. Sholes' Minority Report, 1856—Judge David Noggle and J. T. Mills' Minority Report, 1859—State Association Formed, 1869—Milwaukee Convention—Dr. Laura Ross—Hearing Before the Legislature—Convention in Janesville, 1870—State University—Elizabeth R. Wentworth—Suffrage Amendment, 1880, '81, '82—Rev. Olympia Brown, Racine, 1877—Madame Anneke—Judge Ryan—Three Days' Convention at Racine, 1883—Eveleen L. Mason—Dr. Sarah Munro—Rev. Dr. Corwin—Lavinia Goodell, Lawyer—Angie King—Kate Kane.

FOR this digest of facts in regard to the progress of woman in Wisconsin we are indebted to Dr. Laura Ross Wolcott,* who was probably the first woman to practice medicine in a Western State. She was in Philadelphia during all the contest about the admission of women to hospitals and mixed classes, maintained her dignity and self-respect in the midst of most aggravating persecutions, and was graduated with high honors in 1856 from the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, of which Ann Preston,† M. D., was professor for nineteen years, six years dean of the faculty, and four years member of the board of incorporators. After graduation Laura Ross spent two years in study abroad, and, returning, commenced practice in Milwaukee, where she has been ever since.

By an act of congress approved May 29, 1848, Wisconsin was admitted to the Union. Its diversity of soil and timber, the healthfulness of its climate and the purity of its waters, attracted people from the New England and Middle States, who brought with them fixed notions as to moral conduct and political action, and no little repugnance to many of the features of the old common law. Hence in Wisconsin's territorial conventions and legislative assemblies many of the progressive ideas of the

* Mrs. Wolcott is a remarkable woman, of rare intelligence, keen moral perceptions and most imposing presence. Much of her success in life is due no doubt to her gracious manners. Her graceful figure, classic face, rich voice and choice language make her attractive in the best social circles, as well as in the laboratory and lecture-room. She is a perfect housekeeper and a most hospitable hostess. Having enjoyed many visits at her beautiful home I can speak alike of her public and domestic virtues. —[E. C. S.

† See Vol. I., page 389.

Digitized by Google

East were incorporated into her statutes. Failing to lift married women into any solid position of independence, the laws yet gave them certain protective rights concerning the redemption of lands sold for taxes, and the right to dispose of any estate less than a fee without the husband's consent. In case of divorce the wife was entitled to her personal estate, dower and alimony, and with the consent of her husband she could devise her real estate. She was entitled to dower in any lands of which the husband was seized during marriage. Gen. A. W. Randall was active in making the first digest and compilation of the laws of Wisconsin.

The legislature of 1850 was composed of notably intelligent men. Nelson Dewey was governor, Moses M. Strong, a leading lawyer, speaker of the Assembly, and the late Col. Samuel W. Beal, lieutenant-governor. Early in the session a bill was introduced, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of married women in the enjoyment of their own property," which provoked a stormy debate. Some saw the dissolution of marriage ties in the destruction of the old common-law doctrine that "husband and wife are one, and that one the husband"; while arguments were made in its favor by Hon. David Noggle. George Crasey, and others. Conservative judges held that the right to own property did not entitle married women to convey it; therefore in 1858 the law was amended, giving further security to the wife to transact business in her own name, if her husband was profligate and failed to support her; but not until 1872 did the law protect a married woman in her right to transact business, make contracts, possess her separate earnings, and sue and be sued in her own name. The legislature of 1878 reënacted all the former laws; and married women may now hold, convey and devise real estate; make contracts and transact business in their own names; and join with their husbands in a deed, without being personally liable in the covenants. In the matter of homesteads, the husband cannot convey or encumber without the signature of the wife, and thus a liberal provision is always secure for her and the children.

By the law of 1878, if the husband dies leaving no children and no will, his entire estate descends to his widow.* If the owner of a homestead dies intestate and without children, the homestead descends, free of judgments and claims—except mortgages and mechanics' liens—to his widow; if he leaves children, the widow retains a life interest in the homestead, continuing until her marriage or death.

Thus from the organization of the State, Wisconsin has steadily advanced in relieving married women from the disabilities of the old common law. The same liberal spirit which has animated her legislators has admitted women to equality of opportunities in the State University at Madison; elected them as county superintendents of public schools; appointed them on the State board of charities, and as State commissioners

* During a visit with my school-friend, Mrs. Elizabeth Ford Proudfit, at Madison, in 1879, I heard a great deal said of the injustice of this law as illustrated in two notable cases of widows in the enjoyment of their husbands' entire estates, while the dead men's relatives, many of them, were living in poverty. This was most shocking! though widowers, from time immemorial, have possessed the life-earnings and inheritance of their wives, while the dead women's mothers and sisters were starving and freezing within sight of the luxurious homes that rightfully belonged to them! It makes a mighty odds whose ox is gored—the widower's or the widow's!—[S. B. A.

Digitized by Google

to a foreign exposition;* and welcomed them to the professions of medicine, law and the ministry.

By the constitution of Wisconsin the right of suffrage was awarded to four classes of citizens, twenty-one years and over, who have resided in the State for one year next preceding an election.

First—Citizens of the United States.

Second—Persons of foreign birth who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States.

Third—Persons of Indian blood who have already been declared by act of congress citizens of the United States.

Fourth—Civilized persons of Indian descent who are not members of any tribe.

While thus careful to provide for all males, savage and civilized, down to one thousand Indians outside their tribe, the constitution in no way recognizes the women of the State, one-half its civilized citizens. However, the question of woman suffrage was early agitated in this State, and its advocates were able men. In 1856 there was an able minority report published, from C. L. Sholes, of the Committee on Expiration and Reënactment of Laws, to whom were referred sundry petitions praying that steps might be taken to confer upon women the right of suffrage. In 1857, there was another favorable minority report by Judge David Noggle, and J. T. Mills. It has been twice considered by the legislatures of 1868-69, and 1880-81, failing each time by a small majority. A constitutional amendment is supposed by some to be necessary to effect this needed reform, but the legislature is competent to pass a bill declaring women possessed of the right to vote, without any constitutional amendment. The legislature of New York all through the century has extended the right of suffrage to certain classes and deprived others of its exercise, without changing the constitution. The power of the legislature which represents the people is anterior to the constitution, as the people through their representatives make the constitution.

The women, both German and American, awoke to action and organized a local suffrage society at Janesville in 1868. *The Revolution* said:

> From the report of a recent convention held in Janesville, we find the leading men and women of that city have formed an Impartial Suffrage organization, and are resolved to make all their citizens equal before the law. Able addresses were made by the Rev. S. Farrington, Rev. Sumner Ellis, and a stirring appeal issued to the people of the State, signed by Hon. J. T. Dow, G. B. Hickox, Mrs. J. H. Stillman, Joseph Baker and Mrs. F. Harris Reed. Mrs. Paulina J. Roberts of Racine, a practical farmer in a very large sense, delivered an address which was justly complimented.

The first popular convention held in Wisconsin, with national speakers, convened in Milwaukee February 15, 16, 1869.† The bill then pending in

* In 1867 the governor, General Lucius Fairchild, appointed Laura J. Ross, M. D., as commissioner to the World's Exposition in Paris. In 1871 Mrs. Mary E. Lynde was appointed on the State Board of Charities and Corrections by Governor Fairchild.

† The committee on resolutions were: Dr. Laura J. Ross, N. S. Murphey, Mrs. Livermore, Madame Annecke, Geo. W Peckham and Rev. Mr. Gannett. The officers of the convention were: *President*, Rev. Miss Augusta J. Chapin; *Vice-Presidents*, O. P. Wolcott, M. D., Laura J. Ross, M. D., and Madame Matilde F. Annecke; *Secretary*, Miss Lilia Peckham.

Digitized by Google

the legislature to submit the question of woman suffrage to the electors of the State added interest to this occasion. Parker Pillsbury, in *The Revolution*, said:

The Wisconsin convention seems to have been quite equal in all respects to its predecessors at Chicago and other places. Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony were accompanied to Milwaukee by Mrs. Livermore, a new Western star of "bright particular effulgence," and the proceedings throughout were characterized by argument, eloquence and interest beyond anything of the kind ever witnessed there before. The Milwaukee papers teem with accounts of it, most of them of very friendly tone and spirit, even if opposed to the objects under consideration. The *Evening Wisconsin* said, if any one supposed for an instant that the call for a Woman's Suffrage convention would draw out only that class known as strong-minded, such a one was never more deceived in his or her life. At the opening of the convention * yesterday, the City Hall was crowded with as highly intelligent an audience of ladies and gentlemen as ever gathered there before.

Mrs. Stanton spoke at the evening session to an immense audience on the following resolutions:

Resolved, That a man's government is worse than a white man's government, because in proportion as you increase the rulers you make the condition of the ostracised more hopeless and degraded.

Resolved, That, as the cry of a "white man's government" created an antagonism between the Irish and the negro, culminating in the New York riots of '63, so the Republican cry of "Manhood Suffrage" creates an antagonism between the black man and all women, and will culminate in fearful outrages on womanhood, especially in the Southern States.

Resolved, That by the establishment of an aristocracy of sex in the District of Columbia, by the introduction of the word "male" into the Federal Constitution in Article 14, Section 2, and by the proposition now pending to enforce manhood suffrage in all the States of the Union, the Republican party has been guilty of three excessively arbitrary acts, three retrogressive steps in legislation, alike invidious and insulting to woman, and suicidal to the nation.

Miss Anthony followed showing that every advance step in manhood suffrage added to woman's degradation. Quite a number of ladies and gentlemen † of Wisconsin spoke well of the various sessions of the convention. Altogether it was a most enthusiastic meeting, and the press and the pulpit did their part to keep up the discussion for many weeks after.

These resolutions, readily passed in the Milwaukee convention, had been rejected at all others held in the West during this campaign, although Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony had earnestly advocated them everywhere. They early foresaw exactly what has come to pass, and did their uttermost to rouse women to the danger of having their enfranchisement indefinitely postponed. They warned them that the debate once closed on negro suffrage, and the amendments passed, the question would not be opened again for a generation. But their warnings were unheeded. The fair promises of Republicans and Abolitionists that, the negro question settled, they would devote themselves to woman's enfranchisement,

* For a further description of this convention see Mrs. Stanton's letters from *The Revolution*, Vol. I., page 873.

† Miss Lilia Peckham, G. W. Peckham, esq., Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, Madam Matilde Annecke, Rev. Augusta J. Chapin, Rev. Mr. Eddy, Rev. Mr. English, Rev. Mr. Fallows.

deceived and silenced the majority. How well they have kept their promises is fully shown in the fact that although twenty years have passed, the political status of woman remains unchanged. The Abolitionists have drifted into other reforms, and the Republicans devote themselves to more conservative measures. The Milwaukee convention was adjourned to Madison, where Mrs. Livermore, Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony addressed the legislature, Gov. Fairchild presiding.

In 1870, March 16, 17, a large and enthusiastic convention was held at Janesville, in Lappin's Hall. Rev. Dr. Maxon, Lilia Peckham and Mrs. Stanton were among the speakers. After this, the latter being on a lyceum trip, spoke in many of the chief cities of the State and drew general attention to the question.

The following clear statement of the petty ways in which girls can be defrauded of their rights to a thorough education by narrow, bigoted men entrusted with a little brief authority, is from the pen of Lilia Peckham, a young girl of great promise, who devoted her rare talents to the suffrage movement. Her early death was an irreparable loss to the women of Wisconsin:*

ED. NEWS:—We find proofs at every step that one class cannot legislate for another, the rich for the poor, nor men for women.

The State University, supported by the taxes of the people and for the benefit of the people, should offer equal advantages to men and women. By amendment of the Constitution in 1867, it was declared that the University shall be open to female as well as male students, under such regulations and restrictions as the board of regents may deem proper. At first the students recited together, but Mr. Chadbourne made it a condition of accepting the presidency that they should be separated. I do not speak of the separation of the sexes to find fault. I conceive that if equal advantages be given women by the State, whether in connection with or apart from men, they have no ground for complaint. My object is to compare the advantages given to the sexes and see the practical effect of legislation by men alone in this department. From all the facts that are now pressed upon us, confused, contradictory and obscure, we begin to obtain a glimpse of the general law that informs them. The University has a college of arts (including the department of agriculture, of engraving and military tactics), a college of letters, preparatory department, law department, post-graduate course, last and certainly least, a female college. The faculty and board of instructors number twenty-one. The college of arts has nine professors, one of natural philosophy, one each of mental philosophy, modern languages, rhetoric, chemistry, mathematics, agriculture,

* Miss Lilia Peckham died in Milwaukee, the city of her residence. She had been ill but a few weeks, her physicians considering her recovery certain up to within an hour of her death; but a sudden and unlooked-for change took place. One of the truest, purest and best spirits we have ever met has thus passed from earth to heaven. All who met her soon came to appreciate her gifted nature, her rare talent and spiritual insight. But only those who knew her well can bear witness to her wonderful unselfishness, her remorseless honesty of speech and deed, the loftiness of her ideal and the beauty of her womanly soul. The Milwaukee *Sentinel* closes a brief obituary notice of our friend and co-worker as follows:

"This talented young woman is well known throughout the country as an earnest advocate of the woman's rights movement. Only a few weeks since she made a successful tour through the West, speaking in various city pulpits. Fearlessly she spoke all that she had come to feel was truth, though it shook the very foundations of old creeds and ideas. Many efforts from her scholarly pen attest to her devotion to every onward movement of the hour. She was to have entered the Cambridge Divinity School early in the present autumn, having chosen the ministry for her life-work. That a life so full of promise of usefulness should be so suddenly stopped is irreconcilable with our finite judgment. It is hard to say, 'it is well,' though God's fact may be that this young life, with its beauty of character, its sisterly affection, its still larger sisterly sympathy with a suffering humanity, its longings and aspirations, its zealous strivings after the true and good, is full and complete *now*; still we shall mourn her loss, her brief though beautiful career."

Digitized by Google

and comparative anatomy, and a tutor. In the department of engineering is an officer of the United States Army. In the college of letters is the same faculty, with the addition of William F. Allen, professor of ancient languages and history, one coming from a family of scholarly teachers and thoroughly fitted for his post. In the law department are such names as L. S. Dixon and Byron Paine.

Read now the names composing the faculty of the female college, Paul A. Chadbourne, M. D., president; T. N. Haskell, professor of rhetoric and English literature; Miss Elizabeth Earle, preceptress; Miss Brown, teacher of music; Miss Eliza Brewster, teacher of drawing and painting. Compare these faculties and note what provision is made here for the sciences and languages. Look at the course of instruction in the college of arts. During the first year the men study higher algebra, conic sections, plane trigonometry, German (Otto's) botany, Gibbon's Rome. In the college of letters the course is similar, but more attention is given to classical studies; to Livy, Xenophon and Horace. During the same years in the female college, they are studying higher arithmetic, elementary algebra, United States history, grammar, geography and map drawing. Truly a high standard! The studies in the first term of the preparatory department (to which none can be admitted under twelve years of age) are identical with those in the female college at the same time, except the Latin. Indeed, I cannot see why it would not be an advantage to the students of the female college to go into the preparatory department during their first college year, since they can get their own course with geometry added, and if they stay three years a proportional amount of Latin and Greek. I could compare the whole course in the same way, but my time and the reader's patience would fail. There is no hint either of any thorough prescribed course in any of the languages. In the first and fourth year no foreign language is put down. In each term of the second year French and Latin are written as elective, the same for Latin or German in the third. This is a wretched course at the best. I have no faith in a course set down so loosely as "Latin" instead of being defined as to what course of Latin, and what authors are read. In that case we know exactly how much is required and expected, and what the standard of scholarship. In the college of letters we know that they go from Livy to Cicero on Old Age, then to Horace and Tacitus. Similar definiteness would be encouraging in the female catalogue. Its absence gives us every reason to believe that the course does not amount to enough to add any reputation to the college by being known. Under the head of special information we are told that in addition to this prescribed course of "thorough education young ladies will be instructed in any optional study taught in the college of letters or arts, for which they are prepared." By optional I understand any of the studies marked elective, since they are the only optional studies. In the college of letters there is but one, and that is the calculus. In the college of arts the optional studies are generally, not always, those that they could not be prepared for in the course prescribed by their own college. Under the head of degrees we find a long account of the A. B., A. M., P. B., S. B., S. M., L. B., Ph. D., to which the fortunate gentlemen are entitled after so much study. Lastly, the students of the female college may receive "such appropriate degrees as the regents may determine." I wonder how often that solemn body deliberates as to whether a girl shall be A. B., P. B., or A. M., or whether they ever give them any degree at all. It makes little difference. With such a college course a degree means nothing, and only serves to cheapen what may be well earned by the young men of the college.

In 1870, the stockholders of the Milwaukee Female College elected three women on their board of trustees: Mrs. Wm. P. Lynde, Mrs. Wm. Delos Love and Mrs. John Nazro. This is the first time in the history of the institution that women have been represented in the board of trustees.

Elizabeth R. Wentworth was an earnest and excellent writer and kept up a healthy agitation through the columns of her husband's paper at Racine.

Digitized by Google

RACINE, August 4, 1875.

MY DEAR MISS ANTHONY: Would it not be well for us women to accept the hint afforded by these Englishmen, and bind ourselves together by a constitution and by-laws. By so doing we might sooner be enabled to secure the rights which men seem so persistently determined to withhold from us. Very respectfully yours,

E. R. WENTWORTH.

The growing strength of woman suffrage in England has caused considerable commotion in that country, among officials and others. Its growth has led the men to form a club in opposition to it, composed of such men as Mr. Bouverie, a noted member of Parliament; Sir Henry James, late attorney-general; Mr. Childers, late first lord of the admiralty.

The formation of this club calls out a few words from Mrs. Stanton, who sarcastically says:

Is not this the first organized resistance in the history of the race, against the encroachment of women; the first manly confession by those high in authority—by lords, attorney-generals, sirs, and gentlemen—of fear at the progressive steps of the daughters of men? These conservative gentlemen had no doubt found Lady Amberly, Lydia Becker, and Mrs. Fawcett too much for them in debate; they had probably winced under the satire of Frances Power Cobbe, and trembled before the annually swelling lists of suffrage petitions. Single-handed they saw they were helpless against this incoming tide of feminine persuasiveness, and so it seems they called a meeting of faint-hearted men, and bound themselves together by a constitution and by-laws to protect the franchise from the encroachment of women.

In the legislature of 1880, the proposition to submit an amendment for woman suffrage to a vote of the people, passed both Houses. In 1881 it passed one branch and was lost in the other. Senator Simpson introduced another bill in 1882* which was lost. These successive defeats discouraged the women and they instructed their friends in the legislature to make no further attempts for a constitutional amendment, because they had not the slightest hope of its passage.

The growing interest in the temperance question at this time produced some divisions in the suffrage ranks. Some thought it had been one of the greatest obstacles to the success of the suffrage cause, rousing the opposition of a very large and influential class. Millions of dollars are invested in this State in breweries and distilleries, and members are elected to the legislature to watch these interests. Knowing the terrible sufferings of women and children through intemperance, they naturally infer that the ballot in the hands of women would be inimical to their interests, hence the opposition of this wealthy and powerful class to the suffrage movement. Others thought the agitation was an advantage, especially in bringing the women in the temperance movement to a sense of their helplessness to effect any reform without a voice in the laws. They thought, too, that the power behind the liquor interests was readily outweighed by the moral influence of the best men

* The members of the Wisconsin Senate who voted against the woman suffrage amendment were: Ackley, Adams, Burrows, Chase, Coleman, Delaney, Flinkelberg, Flint, Kusel, Palmetier, Pingel, Rankin, Ryland, Smith and Van Schaick—15. No better work can be done by Wisconsin suffragists than to try to defeat every one of them at the next election. The following voted for the measure: Bennett, Crosby, Ellis, Hamilton, Hill, Hudd, Kingston, Meffert, Phillipps, Scott, Simpson, Wiley, Randall—13. Senators Wing and McKeeby were paired, and Senators Erwin and Richardson were absent.

Digitized by Google

and women in the State, especially as the church began to feel some responsibility in the question. The Milwaukee *Wisconsin* of June 4, 1883, gives this interesting item:

The Rev. Father Mahoney, of St. John's Cathedral, preached a temperance sermon to a large concourse of people yesterday morning, in which he heartily indorsed the action of Mayor Stowell in his war against the ordinary saloon, and declared that he should be reëlected. He also said that the men who opposed him were covering themselves with infamy, and that he could not conscientiously administer the sacraments to any saloon-keeper who refused to obey the commands of the Church or the laws of the State concerning the good order and welfare of the city. The sermon caused quite a stir, and was much discussed in secular as well as religious circles.

The State Association* has maintained an unswerving course, between fanatacism and ultra-conservatism. Since 1869 it has stood as on the watch-tower, quick to see opportunities, and ever ready to coöperate with the legislative bodies in the State, and well may we be proud of our achievements when we remember that by the census of 1870 Wisconsin is the first foreign and the second Roman Catholic State in the Union, and that at our centennial exposition in 1876 our public schools stood number one.

Rev. Olympia Brown Willis moved into the State of Wisconsin in 1877, and became pastor of the church of the Good Shepherd, in Racine, and exerted a wide influence, not only as a liberal theologian, but as an earnest advocate of suffrage for woman. As a result of her efforts a most successful Woman's Council was held in Racine, March 26, 1883, alternating in the church of the Good Shepherd and Blake's Opera House. One of the chief speakers † was Dr. Corwin, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, who was also on the managing committee. The cordiality of many of the western clergy, in strong contrast with those in the east, makes their favorable action worthy of comment, though the liberality of the few is of little avail until in their ecclesiastical assemblies, as organizations, they declare the equality of woman not only before the law, but in all the offices of the church. Mrs. Katharine R. Doud was chosen president of the convention; Mrs. Olin gave the address of welcome, to which Mrs. Sewall responded. Mrs. Doud, in the *Advocate*, thus sums up the three days' meetings:

During the past week a woman's council has been held in Racine, the success of which has been most noticeable. The different sessions have been attended by large audiences of intelligent men and women, who have very thoughtfully and carefully weighed and discussed the various questions under consideration.

From the beginning to the end there has never been a hitch or jar; the myriad wheels of the machinery required to make smooth the workings of such large assemblies have moved so quietly, and have been so well oiled and in such perfect order

* The officers of the Wisconsin State society for 1885 were: *President*, Harriet T. Griswold, Columbus; *Vice-Presidents*, Laura Ross Wolcott, Milwaukee; Rev. Olympia Brown, Racine; Emma C. Bascom, Madison; F. A. Delagise, Antigo; Laura James, Richland Center; *Recording Secretary*, Helen R. Olin, Madison; *Corresponding Secretary*, M. W. Bentley, Schofield; *Treasurer*, Dr. Sarah R. Munro, Milwaukee; *Chairman Executive Committee*, Amelia B. Gray, Schofield. Among others active in the movement are Eliza T. Wilson, Menominee; Alura Collins, Muckwonago; Mrs. S. C. Burnham, Bear Valley; Sarah H. Richards, Milwaukee; Mrs. W. Trippe, Whitewater.

† Eveleen Mason, May Wright Sewall, Mary A. Livermore, Dr. Sarah Munro, Mrs. Haggart, Mrs. K. R. Doud, Miss Comstock, the Grand Worthy Vice-Templar from Milwaukee, Mrs. Le Page, and Mrs. Amy Talbot Dunn, as Zekel's wife, made a deep impression.

Digitized by Google

as to be absolutely unnoticed; really, one might have been tempted to feel that the machine had no master, no controlling hand.

But now that the council is over; now that we can pause and begin to estimate the good that has been done; now that the seed is sown, from which, please God, a grand harvest shall be reaped—now we can look back and see how one brain has planned it all. One clear-eyed, far-seeing will gathered together these women of genius, who have been with us; one practical, mathematical brain made all estimates of expense, and accepted all risks of failure; one hospitable heart received a house full of guests, and induced others to be hospitable likewise; and one earnest, prayerful soul—and this the best of all—besought and entreated God's blessing upon the work. Need we tell you where to find this master-hand which has planned so wisely? the strong will, the clear brain, the warm heart, the pure soul? We all know her; she is indeed a noble woman, and her name—let us whisper lest she hear—is Olympia Brown Willis.

The following sketch of the leading events of her life, shows how active and useful she has been in all her public and private relations:

Olympia Brown was born in Kalamazoo county, Michigan, January 5, 1835. At the age of fifteen she began to teach school during the winter months, attending school herself in the summer. At eighteen she entered Holyoke seminary, but finding the advantages there inadequate for a thorough education, her parents removed, for her benefit, to Yellow Springs, Ohio, where she entered Antioch college, Horace Mann, one of the best educators of his day, being president. There her ambition was thoroughly satisfied, and she was graduated with honor in 1860. She then entered Canton Theological school, was graduated in 1863, and, duly ordained as a Universalist minister, commenced preaching in Marshfield and Montpelier, Vermont, often walking fifteen miles to fill her appointments. In 1864 she was regularly installed over her first parish at Weymouth, Massachusetts. Her energy and fidelity soon raised that feeble society into one of numbers and influence.

In 1869, she accepted a call to Bridgeport, Connecticut, where she remained seven years. In 1878, with her husband, John Henry Willis, and two children she removed to Racine, Wisconsin, where she became pastor of the church of the Good Shepherd, without the promise of a dollar. The church had been given up as hopeless by several men in succession, because of the influence of the Orthodox theological seminary. But she soon gathered large audiences and earnest members about her; established a Sunday school, had courses of lectures in her church during the winter, which she made quite profitable financially for the church, beside educating the people. Outside her profession she has also done a grand work, in temperance and woman suffrage.* She is rarely out of her own pulpit; has generally been superintendent of her own Sunday sohool, and head of the young ladies' club, doing at all times more varied duties than any man would deem possible, and with all this she is a pattern wife, mother and housekeeper, and her noble husband, while carrying on a successful business of his own, stands ever ready to second her endeavors with generous aid and wise counsel, another instance of the happy homes among the "strong minded."

Among the estimable women who have been identified with the cause of woman suffrage in this country, Mathilde Franziska Anneke, a German lady, is worthy of mention:

She was born in Westphalia, April 3, 1817. Her childhood was passed in happy conditions in a home of luxury, where she received a liberal education, yet her married life was encompassed with trials and disappointments. From her own experiences she learned the injustice of the laws for married women and early devoted her pen to the redress of their wrongs. Her articles appeared in leading journals of Germany and awoke many minds to the consideration of the social and civil condition of woman.

---

* See vol. II. page 259.

Digitized by Google

She was identified with the liberal movement of '48, her home being the resort for many of the leaders of the revolution. She published a liberal paper which freely discussed all the abuses of the government, a whole edition of which was destroyed. At length denounced by the government, she secretly made here escape from Cologne, and joined her husband at the head of his command in active preparation for a struggle against the Prussians.

She immediately declared her determination to share the toils of the expedition. Accordingly Col. Anneke appointed her *Tolpfofsort*, the duties of which she continued to discharge to the end of the campaign. In one of her works published in 1853, she has given a graphic description of the disastrous termination of the revolution, of their flight into France, of their expulsion from France and Switzerland, and of their final determination to come to the United States.

They reached New York in the fall of 1849. Madame Anneke lectured in most of the Eastern cities on the social and civil condition of women, claiming for them the right of suffrage and more liberal education. She also published a woman's journal in New York, and was soon recognized as one of the earnest representative women in America. For many years she made her home in Milwaukee, where she taught a successful school for young ladies. Madame Anneke, a widow with one son and two daughters, lived quietly the closing years of her life, and in death found the peace and rest she had never known in her busy life on earth.

Prof. G. S. Albee, president of the State Normal School at Oshkosh, is a firm friend and outspoken advocate of equal right of the sexes to all the privileges of education, not excepting the education of the ballot-box. John Bascom, president of the Wisconsin University, has been an advocate of suffrage for women many years. While connected with Williams College he worked to secure the admission of women thereto. As one of a committee of five to whom the matter was referred, he, together with David Dudley Field, presented a minority report favoring their admission. Since he has been at the head of our State University he has been in perfect sympathy with its liberal coëducational policy, and has insured to the young women equal advantages in every respect with the young men. To his wise management may be attributed the success of higher coëducation in Wisconsin. He gave an able and scholarly address before our convention at Madison in '82, and is always found ready to speak for woman suffrage, both in public and private. His influence has done much for the advancement of the cause in our State. A cordial letter was received from Mrs. Bascom at the last Washington convention, which was listened to with interest and prized by the officers of the National Association:

MADISON, Wis., January 16, 1885.

MY DEAR MISS ANTHONY: I am sorry I cannot be present and meet the many wise and great women who will respond to your call for the Seventeenth Annual Convention.

What a glorious record these words reveal of unwavering faith in the right, and heroic persistency in its pursuit on one side, and what blindness of prejudice and selfishness of power on the other. The struggle has indeed been a long one, and yet no other moral movement involving so many and so great social changes ever made more rapid progress. You and your fellow-laborers are truly to be congratulated on the full and abundant harvest your faithful seed-sowing has brought to humanity. The irrational sentiment, based upon the methods and customs of barbarous times, is rapidly yielding to reason. The world is learning—women are learning—that character, even womanly character, does not suffer from too much breadth of thought, or from too active a sympathy in human interests and human affairs, but is ever enriched by a larger circle of ideas, larger experience, and more extended activities.

Digitized by Google

The advance of women in position and influence has been especially great during the past year, and in directions especially cheering and hopeful to the heart of every woman. In national political conventions, as your call so justly says, she has "actively participated in the discussion of candidates, platforms and principles." The last mile-stone before the goal has been reached and passed!

Your convention will offer the final opportunity to the Republican party. Will it be wise enough to seize it for self preservation, if not from principle? Will there be found in this party enough of spiritual life to lay hold of the help now proffered it, and once more renew its strength thereby? Or will it, as so repeatedly in the past, turn a deaf ear to reason, and still continue to deny the rights of half the human family? If so, if it continue deaf, dumb and blind, then the Republican party has no longer any function, and the power of government will pass forever from its hands. The sixteenth amendment to the national constitution is coming, but it will be the crown of blessing and of fame of another party that will inaugurate this era in social life! I take the liberty to send loving greetings to you and the convention in the name of our Wisconsin Equal Suffrage society. I hope our bright, eloquent Rev. Olympia Brown will be with you. Of Wisconsin's eleven representatives in congress, I am happy to make honorable mention, as broad-minded advocates of our cause, of three, Cameron, Price and Stephenson. In earnest sympathy with the object and method of the convention, and with high regard for yourself, I remain yours truly,

EMMA C. BASCOM.

In this, as in many other States there was a prolonged struggle over the equal rights of women in the courts. The first woman to practice law in Wisconsin was Lavinia Goodell. She was admitted in the First Judicial Circuit Court, June 17, 1874, Judge H. S. Conger, presiding. She commenced practicing in Janesville. The following year she had a case which was appealed to the Supreme Court. When the appeal was made, Miss Goodell applied to the Supreme Court for the right to go with her case. She argued her own case and based her claim upon a statute which provides, "That words of the masculine gender may be applied to females; unless such construction would be inconsistent with the manifest intention of the legislature." After she had shown clearly that she had an equal right in the courts in an able and unanswerable argument, Judge Ryan considered her application for two months and rendered an adverse decision. As a result of the agitation induced by this case, the legislature of 1877 passed a law that "no person shall be refused admission to the bar of this State on account of sex," thus showing the power of the legislative branch of the government to over-ride all judicial decisions. Miss Goodell immediately commenced practice in the Supreme Court. She reviewed the judicial decision with keen satire,* and ably illustrated the comparative capacity of an educated man and woman to reason logically on American jurisprudence and constitutional law.

In the early part of 1879 Kate Kane and Angie J. King were admitted to the bar. Miss Kane studied in a law office and in the law school of Michigan University. She practiced in Milwaukee until 1883, when she located in Chicago. Miss King practices in Janesville and was at first associated with Miss Goodell, under the name of Goodell & King. Cora Hurtz, Oshkosh, was admitted and began practice in 1882.

* For her argument see *Woman's Journal*, April, 1876.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XLVII.

MINNESOTA.

Girls in State University—Sarah Burger Stearns—Harriet E. Bishop the First Teacher in St. Paul—Mary J. Colburn Won the Prize—Mrs. Jane Grey Swisshelm, St. Cloud—Fourth of July Oration, 1866—First Legislative Hearing, 1867—Governor Austin's Veto—First Society at Rochester—Kasson—Almira W. Anthony—Mary P. Wheeler—Harriet M. White—The W. C. T. U.—Harriet A. Hobart—Literary and Art Clubs—School Suffrage, 1876—Charlotte O. Van Cleve and Mrs. C. S. Winchell Elected to School Board—Mrs. Governor Pillsbury—Temperance Vote, 1877—Property Rights of Married Women—Women as Officers, Teachers, Editors, Ministers, Doctors, Lawyers.

MINNESOTA was formally admitted to the Union May 11, 1858. Owing to its high situation and dry atmosphere the State is a great resort for invalids, and nowhere in the world is the sun so bright, the sky so blue, or the moon and stars so clearly defined. Its early settlers were from New England; hence, the church and the school-house—monuments of civilization—were the first objects in the landscape to adorn those boundless prairies, as the red man was pushed still westward, and the white man seized his hunting-ground.

This State is also remarkable for its admirable system of free schools, in which it is said there is a larger proportion of pupils to the population than in any other of the Western States. All institutions of learning have from the beginning been open alike to boys and girls.

Mrs. Sarah Burger Stearns, to whom we are indebted for this chapter, was one of the first young women to apply for admission to the Michigan University.* Being denied, she finished her studies at the State Normal School, and in 1863 married Mr. O. P. Stearns, a graduate of the institution that barred its doors to her. Mr. Stearns, at the call of his country, went to the front, while his no less patriotic bride remained at home, teaching in

* The names of the young women who applied for admission to the classical course of the Michigan State University, in 1858, were Sarah Burger, Clara Norton, Ellen F. Thompson, Ada A. Alvord, Rose Anderson, Helen White, Amanda Kieff, Lizzie Baker, Nellie Baker, Anna Lathrop, Carrie Felch, Mary Becker, Adeline Ladd and Harriet Patton.

Digitized by Google

the Young Ladies' Seminary at Monroe and lecturing for the benefit of the Soldiers' Aid Societies.

The war over, they removed to Minnesota in 1866, where by lectures, newspaper articles, petitions and appeals to the legislature, Mrs. Stearns has done very much to stir the women of the State to thought and action upon the question of woman's enfranchisement. She has been the leading spirit of the State Suffrage Association, as well as of the local societies of Rochester and Duluth, the two cities in which she has resided, and also vice-president of the National Association since 1876. As a member of the school-board, she has wrought beneficent changes in the schools of Duluth. She is now at the head of a movement for the establishment of a home for women needing a place of rest and training for self-help and self-protection. Mrs. Stearns has the full sympathy of her husband and family, as she had that of her mother, Mrs. Susan C. Burger, whose last years were passed in the home of her daughter at Duluth. Mrs. Stearns writes:

The advocates of suffrage in Minnesota were so few in the early days,* and their homes so remote from each other, that there was little chance for coöperation, hence the history of the movement in this State consists more of personal efforts than of conventions, legislative hearings and judicial decisions. The first name worthy of note is that of Harriet E. Bishop. She was invited by Rev. Thomas Williamson, M. D., a missionary among the Dakotas, to come to his mission home and share in his labors in 1847, where she was introduced to the leading citizens of St. Paul. She was the first teacher of a public school in that settlement. She lectured on temperance, wrote for the daily papers, and preached as a regular pastor in a Baptist pulpit. She published several books, was one of the organizers of the State Suffrage Association in 1881, and in 1883 rested from her labors on earth.

The first lecture in the State on the "Rights and Wrongs of Woman," was by Mrs. Mary J. Colburn, in the village of Champlin, in 1858, the same year that Minnesota was admitted to the Union. In 1864, the State officers promised two prizes for the first and second best essays on "Minnesota as a Home for Emigrants," reserving to the examining committee the right to reject all manuscripts offered if found unworthy. The first prize was accorded to Mrs. Colburn. Most of the other competitors were men, some of them members of the learned professions. Mrs. Colburn says, in writing to a friend, "I am doing but little now on the suffrage question, for I will not stoop longer to ask of any congress or legislature for that which I know to be mine by the divine law of nature."

In 1857, Mrs. Jane Grey Swisshelm settled at St. Cloud, where she lived until 1863, editing the St. Cloud *Democrat*, the organ of the Republican party, and making a heroic fight for freedom and equality. In 1860 she

* See Appendix, Chapter XLVII., note A.

Digitized by Google

spoke in the Hall of Representatives, on Anti-slavery; in 1862 she was invited io speak before the Senate on woman's rights, and was listened to with great respect.*

In 1866, at a Fourth of July celebration, Mrs. Stearns accepted an invitation to respond to the sentiment, "Our young and growing State; may she ever be an honor to her citizens." This offered her an opportunity for an off-hand woman suffrage speech, which elicited hearty cheers, and gave, as an old gentleman present said, "something fresh to think of and act upon." About this time the friends of equality began petitioning the legislature for an amendment to the constitution, striking out the word "male." Through the efforts of Mr. A. G. Spaulding—the editor of the *Anoka Star*—and others, these petitions were referred to a special committee which granted a hearing to Mrs. Colburn and Mrs. Stearns in 1867. Mrs. Colburn read a carefully prepared argument, and Mrs, Stearns sent a letter, both of which were ordered to be printed. In 1868 a bill was introduced proposing to submit the desired amendment, but when brought to a vote it was defeated by a majority of one.

In March, 1869, *The Revolution* copied from the Martin County *Atlas* the following:

> Show us the man who from the bottom of his heart, laying aside his prejudices and speaking the unbiased truth, will not say that women should have the same rights that he himself enjoys, and we will show you a narrow-minded sycophant, a cruel, selfish tyrant, or one that has not the moral courage to battle for a principle he knows to be just. Equal rights before the law is justice to all, and the more education we give our children and ourselves, as a people, the sooner shall we have equal rights. May the glorious cause speed on.

In 1869, a suffrage society was organized in the city of Rochester, with fifty members, and another at Champlin; the homes of Mrs. Stearns and Mrs. Colburn. Petitions were again circulated and presented to the legislature early in the session of 1870. It had not then been demonstrated by Kansas, Michigan, Colorado, Nebraska and Oregon, that the votes of the ignorant classes on this question would greatly outnumber those of the intelligent. The legislature granted the prayer of the petitioners and passed a bill for the submission of an amendment, providing that the women of the State, possessing the requisite qualifications, should also be allowed to vote upon the proposition, and that their votes should be counted as legal. The governor, Hon. Horace Austin, vetoed the bill, saying it was not passed in good faith, and that the submission of the question at that time would be premature. In a private letter to Mrs. Stearns, the governor said: "Had the bill provided for the voting of the women, simply to get an expression of their wishes upon the question, without requiring their votes to be counted as legal in the adoption or rejection of it, the act would not have been vetoed, notwithstanding my second objection that it was premature."

In 1871, petitions to congress were circulated in Minnesota, asking a declaratory act to protect the women of the nation in the exercise of "the

* For further account of Mrs. Swisshelm's patriotic work in Minnesota see her "Reminiscences of Half a Century": Janson, McClurg & Co., Chicago, Ill.

Digitized by Google

citizen's right to vote" under the new guarantees of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments. During that year the National Woman Suffrage Association appointed Mrs. Addie Ballou its vice-president for Minnesota.

In 1872 a suffrage club was formed at Kasson. Its three originators* entered into a solemn compact with each other that while they lived in that city there should always be an active suffrage society until the ballot for women should be obtained. Their secretary, Mrs. H. M. White, writes:

Although our club was at first called a ladies' literary society, the suspicion that its members wished to vote was soon whispered about. Our working members were for some years few in number, and our meetings far between. But our zeal never abating, we tried in later years many plans for making a weekly meeting interesting. The most successful was, that every one should bring something that had come to her notice during the week, which she should read aloud, thus furnishing topics of conversation in which all could join. This never failed to make an interesting and profitable meeting. And still later we invited speakers from other States. In our various courses of lectures, Kasson audiences have enjoyed the brave utterances of Anna Dickinson, Julia Ward Howe, Susan B. Anthony, and others. The pulpit of Kasson we have found about evenly balanced for and against us; but those claiming to be friendly generally maintained a "masterly inactivity." Our editors have always shown us much kindness by gratuitously advertising our meetings and publishing our articles. Our members were all at the first meeting after school suffrage was granted to women, and one lady was elected director for a term of three years. The next year another lady was elected. While they were members of the board, a new and beautiful school house was erected, though some men said, "nothing in the line of building could be safely done until after the women's term of office had expired." Our co-workers have always treated us with great courtesy. In this respect our labors were as pleasant as in any church work.

At a temperance convention in 1874, a woman suffrage resolution was ably defended by Mrs. Julia Ballard Nelson and Mrs. Harriet A. Hobart; Mrs. Asa Hutchinson, of beloved memory, also spoke at this meeting.

As the women in several of the States voted on educational matters, the legislature of 1875 wished to confer the same privilege upon the women of Minnesota. But instead of doing so by direct legislation, as the other States had done, they passed a resolution submitting a proposition for an amendment to the constitution to the electors of the State, as follows:

An amendment to the State constitution giving the legislature power to provide by law that any woman of the age of twenty-one years and upwards, may vote at any election held for the purpose of choosing any officers of schools; or upon any measure relating to schools; and also that any such woman shall be eligible to hold any office pertaining solely to the management of schools.

No effort was made to agitate the question, lest more should be effected in rousing the opposition than in educating the masses in the few months intervening between the passage of the bill and the election in November. Mrs. Stearns, however, as the day for the decision of the question approached, wishing to make sure of the votes of the intelligent men of the State, wrote to the editor of the *Pioneer Press*, the leading paper of Minnesota, begging him to urge his readers to do all in their power to secure

* The three women were, Mrs. Almira W. Anthony (whose husband was a cousin of Susan B. Anthony), Mrs. Mary Powell Wheeler and Mrs. Hattie M. White.

Digitized by Google

the adoption of the amendment. The request was complied with, and the editor in a private letter, thanking Mrs. Stearns, said he "had quite forgotten such an amendment had been proposed."

At this last moment the question was, what could be done to secure the largest favorable vote. Finding that it would be legal, the friends throughout the State appealed to the committees of both political parties to have "For the amendment of Article VII. relating to electors—Yes," printed upon all their tickets. This was very generally done, and thereby the most ignorant men were led to vote as they should, with the intelligent, in favor of giving women a voice in the education of the children of the State, while all who were really opposed could scratch the "yes," and substitute a "no." When election day came, November 5, 1875, the amendment was carried by a vote of 24,340 for, to 19,468 against. The following legislature passed the necessary law, and at the spring election of 1876, the women of Minnesota voted for school officers, and in several cases women were elected as directors.

I have given these details because the great wonder has been how the combined forces of ignorance and vice failed to vote down this amendment, as they always have done every other proposition for the extension of suffrage to women in this and every other State where the question has been submitted to a popular vote. I believe our success was largely, if not wholly, attributable to our studied failure to agitate the question, and the affirmative wording of all the tickets of both parties, by which our bitterest opponents forgot the question was to be voted upon, and the ignorant classes who could not, or did not read their ballots, voted unthinkingly for the measure.

In the cities the school officers are elected at the regular municipal elections usually held in the spring, while in the rural districts and smaller villages they are chosen at school meetings in the autumn. In East Minneapolis, Hon. Richard Chute, chairman of the Republican nominating convention, having, without their knowledge, secured the nomination of Mrs. Charlotte O. VanCleve* and Mrs. Charlotte S. Winchell† as

* In a volume of Minnesota biography, Mrs. VanCleve is reported as a woman of great force of character, strong in her convictions of what is right, and fearless in following the dictates of her conscience. She was one of the original founders of the Sisterhood of Bethany, a society for the reformation of unfortunate women, and has held the position of president since its formation. Through the medium of lectures and social influence, she has enlisted the sympathy of a large number of the community. She has served faithfully as a member of the East Minneapolis board of education, and has always improved every opportunity to advocate the right of suffrage for women. She is a member of the State Suffrage Society, and has been for many years honorary vice-president for this State, of the National Suffrage Association. The following interesting fact is told of her, on the authority of Major-General R. W. Johnson. It was given in an address delivered by that gentleman before the old settlers' association of Hennepin county, at a reunion in the city of Minneapolis: Many years ago a soldier at Fort Snelling received an injury to his feet, and mortification ensued. Amputation became necessary and the case could not be postponed until a surgeon could be sent for, because there was none nearer than the post-surgeon at Prairie du Chien. No gentleman in the garrison was willing to undertake so difficult an operation. Equal to any emergency, Mrs. VanCleve, on hearing of the case, resolved to make the attempt. She performed the operation skillfully, and saved the soldier's life.

† Mrs. Charlotte S. Winchell was a graduate of Albion College, Michigan, and came to this State in 1873, with her husband, Prof. Newton H. Winchell, widely known as Minnesota's State geologist. Mrs. Winchell has always been an advocate of suffrage for woman, and cheerfully accepted the position on the school board, serving as clerk. She took an active part in the nominations and elections of school officers. She was chairman of the committee for introducing temperance text books into the schools, secretary of the Woman's Board of Foreign Missions, a member of the State and City Suffrage Societies, and of the Association for the Advancement of Women.

school directors, called a meeting of the women of the city to aid in their election. It was a large and enthusiastic gathering. Mrs. Mary C. Peckham presided, Mrs. Stearns of Duluth, and Mrs. Pillsbury, wife of the governor, made stirring speeches, after which the candidates were called upon, and responded most acceptably. When election day came, the names of Mrs. VanCleve and Mrs. Winchell received a handsome majority of the votes of their districts. A correspondent in the *Ballot-Box* said:

> The women of Minnesota are rejoicing in the measure of justice vouchsafed them, —the right to vote and hold office in school matters. Two hundred and seventy women voted in Minneapolis, the governor's wife among others. Although it rained all day they went to the polls in great numbers.

Including both East and West Minneapolis, fully 1,000 women voted; and while the numbers in other cities and villages were not so great, they were composed of the more intelligent. In St. Charles, where Dr. Adaline Williams was elected to the school-board, some of the gentlemen requested her to resign, on the ground that she had not been properly elected. Her reply was, "If I have not been elected, I have no need to resign; and if I have been elected, I do not choose to resign." But to satisfy those who doubted, she proposed that another election should be held, which resulted in an overwhelming majority for the Doctor.

As the law says women are "eligible to any office pertaining solely to the management of schools," one might be elected as State superindent of public instruction. There have been many women elected to the office of county superintendent, and in several counties they have been twice reëlected,* and wherever women have held school offices, they have been reported as doing efficient service. Although the law provided that women might "vote at any election for the purpose of choosing any officers of schools," the attorney-general gave an opinion that it did not entitle them to vote for county superintendent; hence "an act to entitle women to vote for county superintendent of schools," was passed by the legislature of 1885.

The ladies' city school committee, Miss A. M. Henderson, chairman, secured the appointment of a committee of seven women in Minneapolis, to meet with a like number of men from each of the political parties, to select such members of the school-board as all could agree upon. Having thus aided in the nominations, women were interested in their election. In 1881 Mrs. Merrill and Miss Henderson stood at the polls all day and electioneered for their candidates. It was said that their efforts not only decided the choice of school officers, but elected a temperance alderman. In many cities of the State the temperance women exert a great influence at the polls in persuading men to vote for the best town-officers. At the special election held in Duluth for choosing school officers, one of the judges of election, and the clerks at each of the polling places have for the last two years been women who were teachers in our public schools.

---

* For names of women elected as school directors and county superintendents, see Appendix to Minnesota, Chapter XLVII., Note B.

Digitized by Google

The early homestead law of Minnesota illustrates how easily men forget to bestow the same rights upon women that they carefully secure to themselves. In 1869, the "protectors of women" enacted a law which exempted a homestead from being sold for the payment of debts so long as the man who held it might live, while it allowed his widow and children to be turned out penniless and homeless. It was not until 1875 that this law was so amended that the exemption extended to the widow and fatherless children.

In 1877, a law was passed which gave the widow an absolute title—or the same title her husband had—to one-third of all the real estate, exclusive of the homestead, and of that, it gave her the use, during her lifetime. So that now the widow has the absolute ownership, instead of the life use of one-third of whatever she and her husband may have together earned and saved. That is, should there be any real estate left, over and above the homestead, after paying all the husband's debts, she now has, not merely the difference, as heretofore, between the amount of the tax and the income on one-third, but she may avoid the tax and other costs of keeping it, by selling her third, if she prefers, and putting the money at interest. The law still puts whatever may be left of the other two-thirds, after payment of debts, into the hands of the probate judge and others, and the interest thereof, or even the principal, may go to reward them for their services, or, if falling into honest hands, it may be left for the support and education of the children.

The legislature of 1877 submitted a constitutional amendment giving women a vote on the temperance question. This seemed likely to be carried by default of agitation, as was that of school suffrage, until within a few weeks of the election, when the liquor interest combined all its forces of men and money and defeated it by a large majority. The next year the temperance people made a strong effort to get the proposition re-submitted, but to no purpose.

In 1879, acting upon the plan proposed to all the States by the National Association, we petitioned for the adoption of a joint resolution asking congress to submit to the several State legislatures an amendment to the National constitution, prohibiting the disfranchisement of woman. Mrs. Stearns and others followed up the petitions with letters to the most influential members, in which they argued that the legislatures of the States, not the rank and file of the electors, ought to decide this question; and further, that the same congress that had granted woman the privilege of pleading a case before the Supreme Court of the United States would doubtless pass a resolution submitting to the legislatures the decision of the question of her right to have her opinion on all questions counted at the ballot-box. The result was a majority of six in the Senate in favor of the resolution, while in the House there was a majority of five against it.

Since 1879, our legislature has met biënnially. In 1881 the temperance women of the State again petitioned for the right to vote on the question of licensing the sale of liquor. Failing to get that, or a prohibitory law, they became more than ever convinced of the necessity of full suffrage.

Digitized by Google

The annual meetings of the State Union* have ever since been spoken of by the press as "suffrage conventions," because they always pass resolutions making the demand.

Mr. L. Bixby, editor of the *State Temperance Review*, gives several columns to the temperance and suffrage societies. Mrs. Helen E. Gallinger, the editor of these departments, is a lady of great ability and earnestness. Mr. Charles H. Dubois, editor of *The Spectator*, gives ample space in his columns to notes of women. Miss Mary C. Le Duc is connected with *The Spectator*. Other journals have aided our cause, though not in so pronounced a way. Mrs. C. F. Bancroft, editor of the *Mantorville Express*, and Mrs. Bella French, of a county paper at Spring Valley, Mrs. Annie Mitchell, the wife of one editor and the mother of another, for many years their business associate, have all given valuable services to our cause, while pecuniarily benefiting themselves. The necessity of finding a voice when something needed to be said, and of using a pen when something needed to be written, has developed considerable talent for public speaking and writing among the women of this State.†

All our State institutions are favorable to coëducation, and give equal privileges to all. The Minnesota University has been open to women since its foundation, and from 1875 to 1885 fifty-six young women were graduated with high honor to themselves and their sex.‡ Miss Maria L. Sanford has been professor of rhetoric and elocution for many years. The faculties of the State Normal Schools are largely composed of women. Hamline University and Carlton College are conducted on principles of true equality. At Carlton Miss Margaret Evans is preceptress and teacher of modern languages. Of the Rochester High School, Miss Josephine Hegeman is principal; of Wasioga, Miss C. T. Atwood; of Eyota Union School, Miss Adell M'Kinley.§

For many years Mrs. M. R. Smith was employed as State Librarian. Mrs. H. J. M'Caine for the past ten years has been librarian at St. Paul, with Miss Grace A. Spaulding as assistant. Among the engrossing and enrolling clerks of our legislature, Miss Alice Weber is the only lady's name we find, though the men holding those offices usually employ a half dozen women to assist them in copying, allowing each two-thirds of the price paid by the State, or ten cents per folio.

In this State the suffrage cause has had the sympathy of not a few noble women in the successful practice of the healing art; thus lending their influence for the political emancipation of their sex, while blessing the community with their medical skill. To Doctors Hood and Whetstone is due the credit of establishing the Northwestern Hospital for Women and Children, and training school for nurses, of which they are now the attend-

* The officers of the Minnesota State W. C. T. U. are: *President*, Mrs. H. A. Hobart; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. Mary A. Shepardson, Mrs. E. J. Holley, Mrs. R. C. C. Gale, Mrs. H. C. May, Mrs. L. M. Wylie; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. D. S. Haywood; *Corresponding Secretaries*, Mrs. E. S. Wright, Miss M. E. McIntyre; *Treasurer*, Miss A. M. Henderson. Editor W. C. T. U. department of *Temperance Review*, Mrs. Helen E. Gallinger.

† See Appendix, Chapter XLVII., Note C.

‡ During the same decade 138 young men were graduated from the different departments of the University.

§ For names of graduates and professors, see Appendix, Chapter XLVII., Note D.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

[illegible]

[illegible] Mrs. C. [illegible] Bennett [illegible] Freeman [illegible] county paper [illegible] the wife [illegible] and the [illegible]

[illegible] The [illegible] Stat[illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] ciples of true [illegible] Mrs. [illegible] of the Roc[illegible] [illegible] of Wa[illegible] [illegible] School [illegible] Adele M. Kr[illegible]

[illegible] M. R. [illegible] emp[illegible] [illegible] has be[illegible] [illegible] as assistant. A[illegible] [illegible] stature, Miss Anne W[illegible] [illegible] holding those [illegible] [illegible] in copying, allowing [illegible] [illegible] ten cents per folio.

In [illegible] the [illegible] cause has had the sy[illegible] women [illegible] the successful practice of the hea[illegible] [illegible] for the [illegible] of their [illegible] [illegible] with their medical skill. To Doct[illegible] [illegible] the credit of establishing the Northwestern [illegible] [illegible], and training school for nurses, of whi[illegible]

[illegible] of the Minnesota State W. C. T. U. [illegible] Miss A. S. [illegible] Mrs. E. [illegible] Holley, Mrs. [illegible] [illegible] Secretary, Mrs. D. [illegible] Haywood, [illegible] [illegible] Treasurer, Mrs. A. M. [illegible] Mrs. Helen E. Gallinger.

[illegible] XLVII., Note C.

[illegible] the same decade 138 young men were graduated from [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] of graduates and professors, see Appendix, Chapter XLVII., Note D.

Sarah Burger Stearns.

Digitized by Google

ing physicians; and Dr. Hood also attends the Bethany Home, founded by the sisterhood of Bethany, for the benefit of friendless girls and women. In the town of Detroit may be seen a drug store neatly fitted up, with "Ogden's Pharmacy" over the door, and upon it, in gilt letters, "Emma K. Ogden, M. D." While the doctor practices her profession, she employs a young woman as prescription clerk. The Minnesota State Medical Society has admitted nine women to membership.*

Conspicuous among evangelists in this State are Mrs. Mary C. Nind, Minneapolis, Mrs. Mary A. Shepardson, Wasioga, Mrs. Ruth Cogswell Rowell, Winona, and Rev. Eliza Tupper Wilkes, Rochester.

Thus far this chapter has been given mainly to individuals in the State, and to the home influences that have aided in creating sentiment in favor of full suffrage for woman. United with these have been other influences coming like the rays of the morning sun directly from the East where so many noble women are at work for the freedom of their sex. Among them are some of the most popular lecturers in the country.†

In September, 1881, representative women from various localities met at Hastings and organized a State Woman Suffrage Association ‡ auxiliary to the National. During the first year one hundred and twenty-four members were enrolled. During the second the membership more than doubled. In October, 1882, the association held its first annual meeting. The audiences were large, and the speakers § most heartily applauded. Mrs. Nelson presided. In her letter of greeting to this meeting, from which ill-health obliged her to be absent, the president urged the association to firmly adhere to the principles of the National Association. Let us not ask for an amendment to the State constitution, and thus put it in the power of ignorance and prejudice to deny the boon we seek; while we are auxiliary to the National let us work according to its plans. Mrs. Stearns was unanimously reëlected president, and her views heartily endorsed.

In the spring of '83, at the request of the State society, and with the generous consent of Mr. Bixby, the editor of the *State Temperance Review*, Mrs. Helen E. Gallinger commenced editing a woman suffrage column in that paper. This has been a very convenient medium of communication between the State society and the local auxiliaries which have since been organized by Mrs. L. May Wheeler, who was employed as lecturer and

---

* See Appendix, Chapter XLVII., Note F.

† Miss Anna Dickinson, Mrs. Livermore, Mrs. Howe, Miss Alice Fletcher, Miss Frances Willard, Mrs. Wittenmeyer, Mrs. Sarah B. Chase, M. D. In the years 1875-6, Mrs. Stanton favored our State with a series of lectures that awakened much interest. In 1878-9, Miss Anthony came, and spoke in the principal cities. From Iowa came Mrs. J. Ellen Foster, Matilda Fletcher, and Marianna Folsom, and from Missouri, Miss Phœbe Cousins.

‡ *President*, Sarah Burger Stearns; *Vice-President*, Julia Bullard Nelson; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. C. Smith; *Treasurer*, Mrs. H. J. Moffit; *Executive Committee*, Mrs. Minnie Reed, Mrs. L. H. Clark, Mrs. R. Coons; *Corresponding Sec'y*, Mrs. Laura Howe Carpenter. The following were the charter members: Mrs. Harriet E. Bishop, Mrs. Martha Luly, St. Paul; Mrs. A. T. Anderson, Mrs. H. J. Moffit, Mrs. C. Smith, Minneapolis; Mrs. Harriet A. Hobart, Julia Bullard Nelson, Mrs. R. Coons, Red Wing; Sarah Burger Stearns, Duluth; Mrs. L. C. Clarke, Worthington; Mrs. L. G. Finen, Albert Lea; Mrs. K. E. Webster, Mrs. Minnie Reed, Mrs. M. A. VanHoesen, Hastings.

§ Mrs. Nelson, Mrs. Hobart, Mr. Satterlee, Mrs. Charlotte O. Van Cleve, Mrs. Laura Howe Carpenter, Mrs. Viola Fuller Miner.

Digitized by Google

organizer,* in the summer and fall of 1883. Auxiliary societies had previously been organized by Mrs. Stearns, in St. Paul and Minneapolis. The Kasson society, formed in 1872, also became auxiliary to the State.

During the Northwestern Industrial Exhibition, held in Minneapolis August, 1883, a woman suffrage headquarters was fitted up on the fairgrounds, in a fine large tent, made attractive by flags, banners and mottoes. The State and local societies were represented, officers and members being there to receive all who were in sympathy, to talk suffrage to opposers, to pass out good leaflets, and to exhibit copies of the Woman Suffrage History. At the annual convention this year we were honored by the presence of Julia Ward Howe and Mrs. Marianna Folsom of Iowa, and many of the clergymen † of Minneapolis. Rev. E. S. Williams gave the address of welcome, and paid a beautiful tribute to the self-sacrificing leaders in this holy crusade. Mrs. Howe not only encouraged us with her able words of cheer, but she presided at the piano while her Battle Hymn of the Republic was sung, and seemed to give it new inspiration. In the course of her remarks the president said:

Should congress finally adopt that long-pending amendment in the winter of 1883–4 enfranchising women, we should still have work to do in 1885 to secure the ratification of this amendment by our State legislature. But should congress still refuse, let us be thankful that the way is opening for women to secure their freedom by the power of the legislature independent of all constitutional amendments, as there is nothing in ordinary State constitutions to prevent legislators from extending suffrage to women by legislative enactment. The constitution of the State of Minnesota simply enfranchises men, and does not even mention women; we have clearly nothing to do but to convince our legislators that they are free to give educated women full suffrage.

With this view the society adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That we accept with joy the argument that comes to us from the east and from the west declaring suffrage amendments to State constitutions unnecessary, because the word "male," occurring as it does in most State constitutions, in no wise restrains legislatures from extending full suffrage to women, should they feel inclined to do so. Be it also

Resolved, That it therefore becomes our duty to talk with all men and women who are friendly to our cause, and ask them to examine the argument, and if it commends itself to their judgment, to give us the benefit of their convictions.

Though passing the above resolutions at that time, the State Association of course waits to see what may be done, in view of this new idea, by older and stronger States whose constitutions are similar to ours. Although failing health induced Mrs. Stearns, in the fall of 1883, to resign her suffrage work into other hands, and ask to be excused from any office whatever, she has, with improving health lately accepted the presidency of an Equal Rights League in Duluth. Dr. Ripley was not present

* The societies organized were at Wayzata, Farmington, Red Wing, Mantorville, Excelsior, Rochford, Lake City, Shakopee, and Jordan: committees for suffrage work were also formed in the following places: Anoka, Armstrong, Blakely, Brooklyn Center, Champlin, Frontenac, Long Prairie, Long Lake, and Wabashaw.

† Rev. W. W. Satterlee, Rev. H. M. Simmons, Rev. F. J. Wagner, whose church we occupied, and others. The speakers at this convention were Mr. and Mrs. Dubois, Mrs. Wheeler, Mrs. Elliott, Mrs. Hobart, Mrs. Carpenter, Miss Harriman. Letters were received from Mrs. Devereux Blake, Dr. Clemence Loxier, Rev. J. B. Tuttle, H. B. Blackwell, Lucy Stone and Col. T. W. Higginson.

Digitized by Google

herself at the convention * which chose her for president for the ensuing year, being then at the East, but immediately after returning, she entered upon her new duties with enthusiasm. As there was to be no legislature in 1884, there could be no petitioning, except to continue the work commenced as long ago as 1871, of petitioning congress for a sixteenth amendment. The work was carried on with vigor, and many hundreds of names obtained in a short time. Early in 1884 Mrs. L. May Wheeler continued to lecture in the interests of the suffrage cause. While so engaged she issued her "Collection of Temperance and Suffrage Melodies."

In 1884 a woman suffrage headquarters was again fitted up in Newspaper Row, on the grounds of the Northwestern Industrial Exhibition. The large tent was shared by the State W. C. T. U., and appropriately decked within and without to represent both of the State organizations and their auxiliaries. A large amount of suffrage and temperance literature was distributed among the many who were attracted by the novelty of the sight and sentiments displayed on banners and flags.

As Minneapolis had already become headquarters for the suffrage work of the State, it was thought best to again hold the annual meeting in that city. This was in October, continuing two days, and was both interesting and encouraging. Dr. Martha G. Ripley presided. Many interesting letters were read, and cheering telegrams received.† Miss Marion Lowell recited "The Legend," by Mary Agnes Ticknor, and "Was he Henpecked?" by Phebe Cary, Mrs. A. M. Tyng of Austin, made a good speech, also recited a poem entitled "Jane Conquest." Mr. Lars Oure of Norway, spoke well upon the "Claims of Woman." Dr. L. W. Denton of Minneapolis, gave a very good address. Dr. Martha G. Ripley spoke on suffrage as a natural right, and in support of this view read extracts from a pamphlet entitled, "Woman Suffrage a Right, and not a Privilege," by Wm. I. Bowditch; Eliza Burt Gamble of St. Paul, read a very able paper on "Woman and the Church"; Mrs. Stearns spoke upon the new era to be inaugurated when women have the ballot. Miss Emma Harriman read a bright and entertaining paper. The fine address of the occasion was given by Rev. W. W. Satterlee, showing the nation's need of woman's vote. Judge and Mrs. Hemiup, of Minneapolis, just returned from a visit to Wyoming Territory, were present. The judge made several speeches, and was enthusiastic in his praise of the workings of woman suffrage there. He and his wife are now active members of the State and city (Minneapolis) suffrage societies. The judge is also a member of the State executive committee.

Wishing to give honor to whom honor is due, we would mention the brave young women who have formed the Christian Temperance Unions,

* The officers elected at this convention were: *President*, Martha G. Ripley, M. D., Minneapolis; *Vice-President*, Mrs. Lizzie Manson, Shakopee; *Recording Secretary*, Mary T. Emery, M. D., St. Paul; *Corresponding Secretary*, Emma Harriman, Minneapolis; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Helen E. Gallinger, Minneapolis; *Executive Committee*, Mrs. S. K. Crawford, Anoka; Mrs. M. A. Warner, Hamline; Mrs. F. G. Gould, Excelsior; Rev. E. S. Williams, Prof. W. A. Carpenter, Mrs. A. T. Anderson and Mrs. Laura Howe Carpenter, Minneapolis.

† From John G. Whittier, Mrs. Julia B. Nelson (teaching school in Tennessee) and Henry B. Blackwell.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XLVIII.

DAKOTA.

Influences of Climate and Scenery—Legislative Action, 1872—Mrs. Marietta Bones—In February, 1879, School Suffrage Granted Women—Constitutional Convention, 1883—Matilda Joslyn Gage Addressed a Letter to the Convention and an Appeal to the Women of the State—Mrs. Bones Addressed the Convention in Person—The Effort to Get the Word "Male" Out of the Constitution Failed—Legislature of 1885—Major Pickler Presents the Bill—Carried Through Both Houses—Governor Pierce's Veto—Major Pickler's Letter.

PHILOSOPHERS have had much to say of the effect of climate and scenery upon the human family—the inspiring influence of the grand and the boundless in broadening the thought of the people and stimulating them to generous action. Hence, one might naturally look for liberal ideas among a people surrounded with such vast possessions as are in the territory of Dakota. But alas! there seems to be no correspondence in this republic between areas and constitutions. Although Dakota comprises 96,595,840 acres, yet one-half her citizens are defrauded of their rights precisely as they are in the little States of Delaware and Rhode Island. The inhabitants denied the right of suffrage by their territorial constitution are, the Indians not taxed (a hint that those who pay taxes vote), idiots, convicts and women. But from records sent us by Mrs. Marietta Bones, to whom we are indebted for this chapter, there seem to have been some spasmodic climatic influences at work, though not sufficiently strong as yet to get that odious word "male" out of the constitution. Our Dakota historian says:

The territorial legislature, in the year 1872, came within one vote of enfranchising women. That vote was cast by Hon. W. W. Moody, who, let it be said to his credit, most earnestly espoused the cause in our constitutional convention in 1883, and said in the course of his remarks: "Are not my wife and daughter as competent to vote as I am to hold office?" which question caused prolonged laughter among the most ignorant of the delegates, and cries of, "You're right, Judge!" Although it is deeply to be regretted that through one vote twelve years ago our

Digitized by Google

women were deprived of freedom, yet we must forgive Judge Moody on the ground that "it is never too late to mend."

In February, 1879, the legislature revised the school law, and provided that women should vote at school meetings. That law was repealed in March, 1883, by the school township law, which requires regular polls and a private ballot, so, of course, excluding women from the small privilege given them in 1879. That act, however, excepted fifteen counties *—the oldest and most populous—which had districts fully established, and therein women still vote at school meetings.

In townships which are large and have many schools under one board and no districts, the people select which school they desire their children to attend. The persons who may so select are parents: first, the father; next, the mother, if there be no father living; guardians (women or men), and "persons having in charge children of school age." These persons hold a meeting annually of their "school," and such women vote there, and one of them may be chosen moderator for the school, to hold one year. This office is a sort of responsible agency for the school, and between it and the township board.

Since the legislation upon the subject of school suffrage there has not been much work done for the promotion of the cause. The wide distances between towns and the sparsely settled country make our people comparative strangers to each other. We lack organization; the country is too new; in fact, the most and only work for woman suffrage has been done by Matilda Joslyn Gage and myself, and, owing to disadvantages mentioned, that has been but little. Mrs. Gage reached Dakota just at the close of the Huron convention, held in June, 1883, to discuss the question of territorial division. The resolutions of the convention declared that just governments derived their powers from the consent of the governed; that Dakota possessed a population of 200,000, women included; that the people of a territory have the right, in their sovereign capacity, to adopt a constitution and form a State government. Accordingly, a convention was called for the purpose of enabling those residing in that part of Dakota south of the forty-sixth parallel to organize a State. Mrs. Gage at once addressed a letter to the women of the territory and to the constitutional convention assembled at Sioux Falls:

To the Women of Dakota:

A convention of men will assemble at Sioux Falls, September 4, for the purpose of framing a constitution and pressing upon congress the formation of a State of the southern half of the territory. This is the moment for women to act; it is the decisive moment. There can never again come to the women of Dakota an hour like the present. A constitution is the fundamental law of the State; upon it all statute laws are based, and upon the fact whether woman is inside or outside the pale of the constitution, her rights in the State depend.

The code of Dakota, under the head of "Personal Relations," says: "The husband is the head of the family. He may choose any reasonable place, or mode of living, and the wife must conform thereto." Under this class legislation, which was framed by man entirely in his own interests, the husband may, and in many cases does, file a preëmp-

* These counties are Union, Lincoln, Clay, Minnehaha, Moody, Deuel, Codington, Cass, Walsh, Grand Forks, Pembina, Barnes, Lawrence and Hutchinson.

Digitized by Google

tion claim, build a shanty, and place his wife upon the ground as "a reasonable place and mode of living," while he remains in town in pursuit of business or pleasure.

Let us examine this condition of affairs a little closer. If the wife is not pleased with this "place and mode of living," but should leave it, she is, under this law of class legislation, liable to be advertised as having left the husband's bed and board, wherefore he will pay no debts of her contracting. And how is it if she remains on this until her continued residence upon it has enabled her husband to prove up? Does she then share in its benefits? Is she then half owner of the land? By no means. Chapter 3, section 83, article V. of the Code, says: "No estate is allowed the husband or tenant by courtesy upon the death of his wife, nor is any estate in dower allowed to the wife upon the death of the husband."

This article carries a specious fairness on its face, but it is a bundle of wrongs to woman. By the United States law, only "the head of the family" is allowed to enter lands—either a preëmption, homestead or tree claim. In unison with the United States, the law of Dakota (see chapter 3, section 76) recognizes the husband as the head of the family, and then declares that no estate in dower is allowed to the wife upon the death of her husband. Neither has she any claim upon any portion of this land the husband, as head of the family, may take, except the homestead, in which she is recognized as joint owner. The preëmption claim upon which, in a comfortless claim-shanty, she may have lived for six months, or longer, if upon unsurveyed land, as "the reasonable place and mode of living" her husband has selected for her, does not belong to her at all. She has no part nor share in it. Upon proving, her husband may at once sell, or deed it away as a gift, and she has no redress. It was not hers. The law so declares; but she is her husband's, to the extent that she can be thus used to secure 160 acres of land for him, over which she has no right, title, claim or interest. I have not space to pursue this subject farther, but will assure the women of Dakota that reading the code, and the session laws of the territory will be more interesting to them than any novel. If they wish to still farther know their wrongs, let them look in the code under the heads of "Parent and Child," "Crimes Defined," "Probate Court," etc., etc.

Every woman in Dakota should be immediately at work. Inasmuch as the constitution is the fundamental law of the State, it should be the effort of the women of Dakota to prevent the introduction of the restrictive word "male." The delegates to the Sioux Falls convention have now largely been elected. Address letters of protest to them against making the constitution an organ of class legislation. In as far as possible have personal interviews with these delegates, and by speech make known your wishes on this point. These are your only methods of representation. You have in no way signified your desire for a constitution. You have not been permitted to help make these laws which rob you of property, and many other things more valuable. Many women are settling in Dakota. Unmarried women and widows in large numbers are taking up claims here, and their property is taxed to help support the government and the men who make these iniquitous laws.

I have not mentioned a thousandth part of the wrongs done woman by her being deprived of the right of self-government. Every injustice under which she suffers, as wife, mother, woman, child, in property and person, is due to the fact that she is not recognized as man's political equal—and her only power is that of protest. Lose not a moment, then, women of Dakota, in objecting to the introduction of the word "male" into the proposed new constitution. Besides seeing and writing to delegates, make effort to be present at Sioux Falls during the time of the convention, to labor with delegates from distant points, and to go before committees, and the convention itself, with your protests. Above all, remember that *now* is the decisive hour.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE,
Vice-President-at-Large, National Woman Suffrage Association.

Mrs. Gage also addressed the following to the constitutional convention:

Gentlemen of the Convention: The work upon which you are now engaged is an important one in the interests of liberty, that of framing a constitution for a proposed new State. As a constitution is the fundamental law, its provisions should be general in their character, equally recognizing the rights of all its citizens by its protective powers. Our National principle, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, is becoming more and more widely recognized.

At an early day suffrage was restricted by qualifications of property and education in many of the States, and the removal of such restrictions has been left entirely to the States, except in the one instance of color. Within the last two decades, by amendments to the national constitution, all States are forbidden to exclude citizens from the ballot upon that account

As "sex" is now the only remaining disqualification, on behalf of the National Woman Suffrage Association I ask you to omit the word "male" from your proposed constitution, and leave the women of Dakota free to exercise the right of suffrage. We simply ask you to make your State a true republic, in which all your citizens may stand equal before the law. While foreign men of every nation are welcomed to your magnificent prairies as equals, it is humiliating to the women of the territory, who are helping you to develop its resources, who have endured with you all the hardships of pioneer life, to be treated as inferiors, outside the pale of political consideration. It should be the pride of Dakota to take the initiative step in the legislation of the period, now steadily growing more liberal, and by one generous and graceful act accord to the women of this territory all the rights, privileges and immunities that men claim for themselves.

MATILDA JOSLYN GAGE,
Vice-President-at-Large, N. W. S. A.

Aberdeen, Dakota, Sept. 3, 1883.

It is to be regretted that the argument presented by Mrs. Gage could not convince that honorable body of the injustice of laws towards woman. To me was given the privilege of addressing the convention. I said:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: The honor conferred on me, of being allowed to address you on this important occasion is fully appreciated. I am here in behalf of the women of our territory, who are opposed to being left in the State organization with no more authority in the government than paupers, lunatics and idiots. We are willing to do one-half of the manual labor in this country, and will promptly pay our portion of the taxes. As sober and peaceful citizens, we compare favorably with the other sex. I have the honor to present to you a petition signed by hundreds of Day county voters, praying your honorable body not to allow the word "male" to be incorporated within our State constitution. There is no doubt that this petition speaks the honest sentiment of the people throughout the territory. In but a single instance was I refused a name, and in a second case a man hesitated, saying, "Well, now, if it's as many rights you're wantin' es I hev got fur meself, you'll be after signin' my name fur me—fur I niver do any writin' at all fur meself." And yet that man whose name I had to write has more rights in this, his adopted country, than I and all other women have in this our native land. The right of franchise, which has heretofore been regarded as a privilege, should more properly be considered a right—a right to be exercised by every citizen for the public good. If there is not another woman in Dakota who wants to vote, I do! There is no doubt that many women are indifferent upon this subject, but when once given the ballot you will see that their progress will equal, if not exceed, that of the emancipated slaves in the South. Look at Wyoming Territory, where woman suffrage has a fair test; no one will deny it has proved a marked success. Elections there now are quiet and more orderly than they are elsewhere. Before the enfranchisement of the women of Wyoming, election days were a terror generally, being both boisterous and riotous. It is really true that Dakota men are the most

energetic and enterprising anywhere to be found, and in number they largely exceed our women. Gentlemen, make this the most advantageous State for women, and they will soon be wending their way hither. Women have been granted select committees in both Houses of congress, and better still, each of those committees has given us a majority report in favor of a sixteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States, prohibiting the disfranchisement of citizens on account of sex. Gentlemen, delegates of this State constitutional convention, I now appeal to your highest sense of honor and justice to give us the right to vote—give it to us, not because we possess any particular merit, but give it to us because it is our right! Then Dakota will in fact be "a home of the free"—honored by all nations, and the Banner State of the Union [applause].

But, after all our work and pleading, they turned a deaf ear—infinitely worse, they were dishonest; at least this was true of the committee on elections. I was present at every meeting of that committee. At their last, I was with them three hours (the entire session) to answer objections. One member made the motion, "that the word 'male' be not incorporated within our State constitution." The vote on the motion was a tie, when the chairman cast his vote in the affirmative. After weeks of hard work I had reached the goal! and with eyes brim full of tears, thanked that committee. They then adjourned, to report in open convention the next morning to my utter surprise, that "Women may vote at school elections and for school officers." No words of mine can express the disappointment and humiliation this defeat of justice caused me.

Among the hundreds of questions asked me by that committee were these: "Do you want a prohibitory plank in our State constitution?" Answer: "No; prohibition should be settled by the people; it cannot be with one-half our citizens disfranchised, and that half its most earnest advocates." "Do you think prohibition prohibits?" "No; man's prohibitory laws are good enough, but he does not enforce them; women have not the authority to do so; but if you will give us the power, we will soon have prohibition that *will* prohibit." A voice: "I believe it!" "Do you think the majority of women want to vote?" "I do not; but is that any reason why you should deprive the one who does? You do not force men to vote; women, as a rule, have not given this subject the attention they should; many of them are as ignorant of the advantages the ballot would secure as were the negroes when John Brown raised the insurrection at Harper's Ferry."

There is a trite saying: "The darkest hour is just before the dawn." The day cannot be far distant when Dakota's women will be free; for the most intelligent men, and those occupying the most prominent positions in our territory, are avowed friends of suffrage. Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court for Dakota, Hon. A. J. Edgerton, said in his Fourth of July oration here: "How necessary it is for us to elect only good and honest men to office! To do this, woman likewise must act her part in the labor of arresting the advance of crime and corruption, although through timidity the politician is slow to invest her with the higher duties and obligations of American citizenship."

This same just judge has appointed a woman (Mrs. Washburn of Chamberlain) stenographer of his judicial district—the best salaried office in

Digitized by Google

his gift.* With the assistance of this grand man (occupying the highest position in our territory), and many others equally efficient, it is not to be supposed that our most intelligent women will be obliged to wait for the education of the most ignorant men to consent to their enfranchisement.

In the last legislature (1885) Major John A. Pickler introduced a bill enfranchising the women of the territory, which, after full discussion, passed the House by 29 to 18,† and the Council by 14 to 10. The hopes of the friends were soon disappointed by the governor's veto:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE, BISMARCK, D. T., March 13, 1885.

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

I herewith return House file No. 71, with my objections to its becoming a law. A measure of this kind demands careful and candid consideration, both because of its importance and because of the acknowledged sincerity and high character of those who favor it. There are certain reasons, however, why I cannot approve such a measure at this time, and other reasons why I cannot approve this particular bill. It is desirable, in my judgment, that we act, so far as possible, as if we were governed, restrained and guided by a constitution adopted by ourselves. If we had a constitution modeled after those of the States, an extraordinary proposition like this would be submitted to the people. If congress thinks woman suffrage wise, it has the power to establish it. It is unfair to shift the responsibility on the territory and then hold it responsible for alleged imprudent legislation. I am assured the enactment of this law will delay our claims to statehood, and in so critical a period it is better that no pretext whatever be given for such postponement. It is doubted by many if a majority of the women of Dakota want the franchise. The point is made, and a very good one, that the fact that one woman does not want a right is not a justifiable reason for refusing it to another who does, yet it must not be forgotten that the enfranchisement of women confers not only a privilege but a grave burden and responsibility. We condemn the man who neglects to vote as recreant to his duty. If women are enfranchised, the right conferred becomes an obligation as imperious to them as to men; on those opposed as on those who favor the act. I think the women of Dakota should have a voice in determining whether they should assume this burden or not. So much for the general proposition. There are two other features of this bill which I can scarcely think satisfactory to the advocates of woman suffrage themselves. I am satisfied that they should appear in a measure claiming to advance the rights of women. If the vote of a woman is needed anywhere, it is in our cities. In many existing city charters a distinct clause appears, providing that males alone shall possess the qualifications of electors. In this bill the word "male" is only stricken out of one chapter of the code, leaving the disability still standing against hundreds of women equally entitled to recognition. The women of Sioux Falls, the women of Mitchell, the women of Brookings, the women of Chamberlain, of Watertown and a great many of the more important cities in southern Dakota, would be disqualified from voting under these special enactments, even though this bill became a law at this very session. Charters have been created with that provision retained, and they would make this bill abortive and largely inoperative. A still more objectionable feature, and one deliberately inserted, is the clause debarring women from the right to hold office. If the word

* Since 1882 Mrs. Bones has held the office of deputy-clerk of the District Court of Day county: Mrs. Washburn was appointed to her office in 1884; Miss Elizabeth M. Cochrane, appointed by Judge Seward Smith, is clerk of the District Court of Falk county; Mrs. Virginia A. Wilkins is deputy-clerk of the District Court of Hand county; Mrs. Dutton, deputy county-clerk, and Mrs. Hanson deputy-sheriff of Day county; and Mrs. Pease is deputy-receiver of the Watertown Land-office.

† *Yeas*—Barnes, Blackmore, Coe, Bayard, Clark, Dermody, Gregg, Hutson, Johnson, Miller, McCall, Parshall, Pierce, Roach, Southwick, Smith, Stebbins, J. P. Ward, Huntington, Hutchinson, Langan, Martin, Morgan, Pickler, Riddell, Steele, Stevens, Sprague, Stewart—29. *Nays*—Davison, Hobart, Larson, McCumber, Oliver, Pugh, Ruger, Strong, Eldridge, Helvig, Myron, McHugh, Runkle, Swanton, Van Osdell, Williams, Mark Ward, Mr. Speaker—18.

Digitized by Google

"male" had been stricken out of the code, and no other action taken, they would have been eligible, and I believe there is a wide feeling that many offices, particularly those connected with penal and benevolent institutions, could be most appropriately filled with women, but this clause practically forbids their appointment. If women are good enough to vote they are good enough to be voted for. If they are qualified to choose officials, they are qualified to be chosen. I don't say that I would approve this measure were it otherwise worded, but I certainly would not indorse a bill which thus keeps the word of promise to the ear and breaks it to the hope, which deliberately and avowedly debars and disqualifies women while assuming to exalt and honor them. These objections are apart from the abstract right of women to the ballot, but they show how necessary it is to approach such a subject with deliberation. If women are to be enfranchised, let it be done, not as a thirty days' wonder, but as a merited reform resulting from mature reflection, approved by the public conscience and sanctioned by the enlightened judgment of the people.

[Signed:] GILBERT A. PIERCE, *Governor.*

An effort was promptly made to carry the measure over the governor's veto, which failed by a vote of 18 to 26.

During the last session of the legislature a large public meeting was held in Bismarck, at which many of the members spoke strongly in favor of the woman suffrage amendment, the chief-justice and a majority of his associates advocating the measure. Mrs. Gage, in a letter from Dakota, said:

An acquaintance of mine, the owner of a green-house, sent each of the members voting "aye" a buttonhole bouquet, a badge of honor which marked our friends for a few hours at least. It is a pertinent fact that, while the opposition insist that women do not want to vote, in a single county of this sparsely settled territory 222 women did vote in the midst of a severe storm. In a series of articles signed "Justice," published in the Bismarck *Tribune*, we find the following:

The women of Dakota do desire the power to vote. One year ago a majority of the commissioners of Kingsbury county signed a request that at an election to be held March 4, 1884, the women should, with the men, express their wishes by vote upon a specified question of local policy. The women immediately responded, prepared their separate ballot-boxes, placed them in charge of the election officers by the side of the men's boxes upon the same table at De Smet and other towns, and voted all day side by side with the men, casting throughout the county 222 votes. A more orderly election was never known. No self-respect was lost and no woman was lowered in public esteem. Clergymen, lawyers, merchants, farmers, all voted with their wives, the ballots going into different boxes. One thousand men voted in the county. The day was stormy and snow deep on the ground. If 222 women in one county would without previous experience spring forward to vote on a week's notice, is it to be supposed they do not appreciate the right? JUSTICE.

Mr. Pickler, who had taken an active part in the discussion on the amendment, received many letters of thanks from the friends of woman suffrage throughout the nation, and made his acknowledgments in the following cordial letter to Mrs. Matilda Joslyn Gage:

FAULKTON, D. T., April 20, 1885.

Matilda Joslyn Gage, Syracuse, N. Y.:

DEAR MADAM: Your kind letter addressed to me on the Woman Suffrage bill, at Bismarck, would have been earlier acknowledged had it not been that I suffered quite a severe illness upon my return from the legislature. I beg to assure you that words of encouragement from such able and distinguished personages as yourself have been highly appreciated in my effort to secure suffrage for women in Dakota. I am half inclined to think that your indication as to a coming political party, with woman suffrage as one plank in its platform, may not be without foundation.

Digitized by Google

I introduced the bill in the Dakota legislature, having previously supported a like measure in the Iowa legislature, really without consultation with any one, or without knowledge as to the sentiment of the members upon the question. I have had my convictions since my college days that simple justice demands that woman should have the ballot, and in this opinion I am warmly seconded by my wife, who desires to vote, as I think all sensible women should. I was pleased with the favor the bill received, and after a week or two believed it possible to have it pass the House, with constant exertion and watchfulness. Those who at first laughed at the idea, learning I was very much in earnest, stopped to consider and to discuss, and finally came to vote for it.

It passed the House, and after considerable difficulty in getting it out of the hands of an adverse committee in the Council, who insisted on having it referred to them, it passed with an amendment "to submit to a vote of the people." I managed to have the House refuse to concur in this amendment, which resulted in a conference committee, five out of six of whom reported in favor of the Council receding from their amendment, which they did, and yet, after all, and when we thought it safe, it was vetoed. Few, if any, supposed that Governor Pierce, a governor only appointed over us less than six months, would place himself a barrier in the way of the will of the people, and opposed to the advancement of human rights. I deeply regret that he did not rise to the grandest opportunity of his life, but he failed to do so.

Your words were particularly encouraging, being personally interested in Dakota as you are, and I dare say you will bear witness that we have an intelligent people, and a great many good women, land-owners and property-holders, who should have a voice in the taxation of their property, real and personal. We shall not give it up; we shall continue in the work, not doubting that success will finally crown our efforts. Our constitution is not yet formed, and if ever the political parties cease to exercise their tyranny over us, by allowing us to be admitted as a State, we shall endeavor at least to secure it so the legislature may grant or prescribe the qualifications of voters without requiring a change in the constitution.

Will you visit Dakota again? In another contest we would be much aided by your presence and assistance, confidently believing that "Heaven will one day free us from this slavery." If your children* reside in this section of the territory, I should be pleased to form their acquaintance. Again thanking you for your kind words, I am,

Yours truly, J. A. PICKLER.

As Dakota has thus deliberately trampled upon the rights of one-half her people, it is to be hoped that congress will not admit her into the Union until that odious word "male" is stricken from her constitution.

---

* Mrs. Gage has a son and daughter residing in Dakota, both well educated, superior young people, whose influence will, no doubt, be felt in every progressive movement in that State. Mrs. Gage's children sympathize with their mother in her broad, liberal views on all questions.—[E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER XLIX.

NEBRASKA.

Clara Bewick Colby—Nebraska Came into the Possession of the United States, 1803—The Home of the Dakotas—Organized as a Territory, 1854—Territorial Legislature—Mrs. Amelia Bloomer Addresses the House—Gen. Wm. Larimer, 1856—A Bill to Confer Suffrage on Woman—Passed the House—Lost in the Senate—Constitution Harmonized with the Fourteenth Amendment—Admitted as a State March 1, 1867—Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony Lecture in the State, 1867—Mrs. Tracy Cutler, 1870—Mrs. Esther L. Warner's Letter—Constitutional Convention, 1871—Woman Suffrage Amendment Submitted—Lost by 12,676 against, 3,502 for—Prolonged Discussion—Constitutional Convention, 1875—Grasshoppers Devastate the Country—*Inter-Ocean*, Mrs. Harbert—Omaha *Republican*, 1876—Woman's Column Edited by Mrs. Harriet S. Brooks—"Woman's Kingdom"—State Society formed, January 19, 1881, Mrs. Brooks President—Mrs. Dinsmoore, Mrs. Colby, Mrs. Brooks, before the Legislature—Amendment again Submitted—Active Canvass of the State, 1882—First Convention of the State Association—Charles F. Manderson—Unreliable Petitions—An Unfair Count of Votes for Woman Suffrage—Amendment Defeated—Conventions in Omaha—Notable Women in the State—Conventions—*Woman's Tribune* Established in 1883.

CLARA BEWICK COLBY, the historian for Nebraska, is of English parentage, and came to Wisconsin when eight years of age. In her country home, as one of a large family, she had but scant opportunities for attending the district school, but her father encouraged and assisted his children to study in the winter evenings, and in this way she fitted herself to teach in country schools. After a few terms she entered the State University at Madison, and while there made a constant effort to secure equal privileges and opportunities for the students of her sex. She was graduated with honors in 1869, and at once became a teacher of history and Latin in the institution. She was married to Leonard W. Colby, a graduate of the same university, and moved to Beatrice, Nebraska, in 1872. Amidst the hardships of pioneer life in a new country, the young wife for a season found her family cares all-absorbing, but her taste for study, her love of literature and her natural desire to improve the conditions about her, soon led her to work up an interest in the establishment of a library and course of lectures. She afterwards edited a department in the Beatrice *Express* called "Woman's Work," and in

Digitized by Google

1883 she started *The Woman's Tribune*, a paper whose columns show that Mrs. Colby has the true editorial instinct. For several years she has been deeply interested in the movement for woman's enfranchisement, devoting her journal to the advocacy of this great reform. In addition to her cares as housekeeper * and editor, Mrs. Colby has also lectured extensively in many States, east and west, not only to popular audiences, but before legislative and congressional committees.

In her description of Nebraska and the steps of progress in woman's civil and political rights, Mrs. Colby says:

Nebraska makes its first appearance in history as part of Louisiana and belonging to Spain. Seized by France in 1683, ceded to Spain in 1762; again the property of France in 1800, and sold to the United States in 1803; the shifting ownership yet left no trace on that interior and inaccessible portion of Louisiana now known as Nebraska. It was the home of the Dakotas, who had come down from the north pushing the earlier Indian races before them. Every autumn when *Heyokah*, the Spirit of the North, puffed from his huge pipe the purpling smoke "enwrapping all the land in mellow haze," the Dakotas gathered at the Great Red Pipestone Quarry for their annual feast and council. These yearly excursions brought them in contact with the fur traders, who in turn roamed the wild and beautiful country of the Niobrara, returning thence to Quebec laden with pelts. With the exception of a few military posts, the first established in 1820 where the town of Fort Calhoun now stands, Nebraska was uninhabited by white people until the gold hunters of 1849 passed through what seemed to them an arid desert, as they sought their Eldorado in the mountains beyond. Disappointed and homesick, many of the emigrants retraced their steps, and found their former trail through Nebraska marked by sunflowers, the luxuriance of which evidenced the fertility of the soil, and encouraged the travelers to settle within its borders.

Nebraska became an organized territory by the Kansas-Nebraska bill in 1854, including at first Dakota, Idaho and Colorado, from which it was separated in 1863. The early settlers were courageous, keeping heart amid attacks of savages, and devastations of the fire-demon and the locust. Published history is silent concerning the part that women took in this frontier life, but the tales told by the fireside are full of the endurance and heroism of wives whose very isolation kept them hand to hand, shoulder to shoulder, and thought to thought with their husbands. It is not strange then that the men of those early days inclined readily to the idea of sharing the rights of self-government with women who had with them left home and kindred and the comforts of the older States. But it is re-

* Having visited Beatrice twice to speak in different courses of lectures arranged by Mrs. Colby, I can testify to her executive ability alike in her domestic and public work. She can get up a meeting, arrange the platform, with desk and lights, and introduce a speaker with as much skill and grace as she can spread a table with dainty china and appetizing food, and enliven a dinner with witty and earnest conversation.—[E. C. S.

markable, and proof that the thought belongs to the age, that, thirty years ago, when the discussion of woman's status was still new in Massachusetts and New York, and only seven years after the first woman-suffrage convention ever held, here—half way across a continent, in a country almost unheard of, and with but scant communication with the older parts of the Republic—this instinctive justice should have crystalized into legislative action.

In December, 1855, an invitation was extended by the territorial legislature to Mrs. Amelia Bloomer of Council Bluffs, to deliver an address on woman's rights, in the Hall of the House of Representatives. This invitation was signed by twenty-five members of the legislature and was accepted by Mrs. Bloomer for January 8. The following pleasing account of this address and its reception was written by an Omaha correspondent of the Council Bluffs *Chronotype* of that date:

Mrs. Amelia Bloomer, who had been formally invited by members of the legislature and others, arrived at the door of the state-house at 7 o'clock, P. M., and by the gallantry of Gen. Larimer, a passage was made for her to the platform. The house had been crowded for some time with eager expectants to see the lady and listen to the arguments which were to be adduced as the fruitage of female thought and research. When all had been packed into the house who could possibly find a place for the sole of the foot, Mrs. Bloomer arose, amid cheers. We watched her closely, and saw that she was perfectly self-possessed—not a nerve seemed to be moved by excitement, and the voice did not tremble. She arose in the dignity of a true woman, as if the importance of her mission so absorbed her thoughts that timidity or bashfulness were too mean to entangle the mental powers. She delivered her lecture in a pleasing, able, and I may say, eloquent manner that enchained the attention of her audience for an hour and a half. A *man* could not have beaten it.

In mingling with the people next day, we found that her argument had met with much favor. As far as property rights are concerned, all seemed to agree with the lady that the laws of our country are wrong, and that woman should receive the same protection as man. All we have time to say now is, that Mrs. Bloomer's arguments on woman's rights are unanswerable. We may doubt it is policy for women to vote, but who can draw the line and say that naturally she has not a right to do so? Mrs. Bloomer, though a little body, is among the great women of the United States; and her keen, intellectual eye seems to flash fire from a fountain that will consume the stubble of old theories until woman is placed in her true position in the enjoyment of equal rights and privileges. Her only danger is in asking too much. ONEIDA.

Eight days after Mrs. Bloomer's address, Hon. Jerome Hoover, member for the counties of Nemaha and Richardson, introduced in the House a bill to confer suffrage equally upon women. The bill was put upon its third reading, January 25, and was earnestly championed by General William Larimer of Douglas county, formerly of Pittsburgh, Pa. It passed by a vote of 14 to 11.* The result of the passage of the bill by the House was graphically described by the *Chronotype* of January 30:

On Friday afternoon and evening quite an excitement took place, which resulted in offering an insult to one of the ablest members of the legislature, but which, while it reflected no dishonor upon the person against whom it was aimed, should cover the

* *Yeas*—Messrs. Boulwere, Buck, Campbell, Chambers, Clancy, Davis, Decker, Hail, Haygood, Hoover, Kirk, Larimer, Rose, Sullivan—14.

Nays—Messrs. Beck, Bowen, Gibson, Harsh, Laird, Miller, Moore, Morton, McDonald, Rider, Salisbury—11.

Digitized by Google

perpetrators with lasting shame. We will state briefly the facts as we have heard them.

The bill giving woman the right to vote came up at 11 o'clock, by a special order of the House. A number of ladies entered the hall to listen to the proceedings. General Larimer spoke eloquently and ably in favor of the bill, making, perhaps, the best speech that could be made on that side of the question. On the vote being taken, it stood—ayes 14, nays 11. The bill was then sent to the Council, where it was referred to the Committee on Elections. Its passage by the House of Representatives created a great deal of talk, and several members threatened to resign. At the evening session J. S. Morton, W. E. Moore, A. F. Salisbury and L. L. Bowen came into the House and proposed to present General Larimer with a petticoat, which did not tend much to allay the excitement. The General, of course, was justly indignant at such treatment, as were also the other members. The proposal was characteristic of the prime mover in it, and we are astonished that the other gentlemen named should have been willing to associate themselves with him in offering this indignity to the oldest and most respected member of the body—a man who was elected to the station he has so ably filled by the unanimous vote of the people of Douglas county. General Larimer had a perfect right to advocate or oppose the bill according to his own sense of duty, and any man, or set of men, who would attempt to cast insult or ridicule upon him for so doing, is worthy only of the contempt of decent people. In saying this we, of course, express no opinion on the merits of the bill itself.

The bill was taken up in the Council, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Elections, whose chairman, Mr. Cowles, reported it back without amendment, and recommended its passage. This being the last day of the session, the bill could not come up again. The *Chronotype*, after the adjournment, commented as follows:

The bill granting women the right to vote, which had passed the House, was read the first and second time in the Council and referred to the Committee on Elections, where it now remains for want of time to bring it up again. A gentleman who was opposed to the passage of a bill to locate the seat of justice of Washington county, obtained the floor, and delivered a speech of many hours on some unimportant bill then under consideration, in order to "kill time" and prevent the Washington county bill from coming up. The hour for adjournment *sine die* arrived before he concluded, and the Woman Suffrage bill, and many others of great importance, remained upon the clerk's table without being acted upon. It is admitted by every one that want of time only defeated the passage of the bill through the Council. The citizens of Nebraska are ready to make a trial of its provisions, which speaks volumes for the intelligence of the free and independent squatters of this beautiful territory.

Mrs. Bloomer says that assurance was given by members of the Council that the bill would have passed that body triumphantly had more time been allowed, or had it been introduced earlier in the session. The general sentiment was in favor of it, and the gentlemen who talked the last hours away to kill other bills were alone responsible for its defeat. Mrs. Bloomer followed up her work by lectures in Omaha and Nebraska City two years later.

The exigencies attending the settlement of the territory and the absorbing interests of the civil war occupied the next decade. The character of the settlers may be inferred from the fact that, with only about 5,000 voters, Nebraska gave over 3,000 soldiers for the defense of the Union and of their home borders, where the Indians had seized the occasion to break out into active hostilities. The war over, Nebraska sought to be admitted as a State, and a constitution was prepared on the old

Digitized by Google

basis of white male suffrage. Congress admitted Nebraska, but provided that the act should not take effect until the constitution should be changed to harmonize with the fourteenth amendment. After some discussion the condition was accepted, and Nebraska was thus the first State to recognize in its constitution the sovereignty of all male persons. Some of the debates of this time indicate that the appreciation of human rights was growing, nor were allusions wanting making a direct application of the principle to women. The debates and resolutions connected with the ratification of the fourteenth amendment are historically and logically connected with the growth of the idea of woman's political equality. The man who, from regard for justice and civil liberties, advocates the right of franchise for additional classes of men, easily extends the thought until it embraces woman. On the other hand the man who sees men enfranchised whom he deems unworthy to use the ballot, thinks it a disgrace to withhold it from intelligent women. Gov. Alvin Saunders,* in his message urging the ratification of the fourteenth amendment said:

The day, in my opinion, is not far distant when property qualifications, educational qualifications, and color qualifications, as precedent to the privilege of voting, will be known no more by the American people, but that intelligence and manhood will be the only qualifications necessary to entitle an American citizen to the privilege of an elector.

Later, Acting-governor A. S. Paddock* in his message said:

I should hail with joy a radical change in the rule of suffrage which would give the franchise to intelligence and patriotism wherever found, regardless of the color of the possessor.

The majority report of the committee to whom was referred that portion of the governor's message which related to rights of suffrage, was as follows:

We hold that the dogma of partial suffrage is a dangerous doctrine, and contrary to the laws of nature and the letter and spirit of the Declaration of Independence.

[Signed:] ISAAC WILES, WILLIAM DAILEY, GEORGE CROW.

A minority report was brought in by S. M. Curran and Aug. F. Harvey. On its rejection Mr. Harvey introduced this resolution:

Resolved, That we, the members of the House of Representatives, of the legislature of Nebraska, are in favor of impartial and universal suffrage, and believe fully in the equality of all races, colors and sexes at the ballot-box.

This was not intended to advance the rights of women, but simply to slay the advocates of the enlargement of the franchise with their own weapons. A. B. Fuller moved to amend by striking out the word "universal," and all after the word "suffrage," which was carried by a vote of 22 to 9. The Committee on Federal Relations reported:

The constitution recognizes all persons born within the United States, or naturalized in pursuance of the law, to be citizens, and entitled to the rights of citizenship; and a recent act of congress amends the organization acts of the several territories so as to

* It is a pleasure to record that both these gentlemen have reached the logical result of their former views, and now advocate giving the franchise to intelligence and patriotism regardless of the sex of the possessor. Governor Saunders, in the capacity of United States Senator, cast a favorable ballot on measures in any manner referring to woman's civil rights, and in 1882 spoke on the platform of the National Association, at its Washington convention.

Digitized by Google

confer the rights of suffrage upon all citizens except such as are disqualified by reason of crime. Consequently, when congress decrees that we shall not, as a State, deprive citizens of rights already guaranteed to them, it does not transcend its powers, or impose upon us conditions from which we are now exempt.

With these discussions of fundamental principles which, although couched in the most comprehensive terms, strangely enough conserved the rights of only half the citizens, the fourteenth amendment was ratified, and Nebraska became a State on March 1, 1867.

The early legislation of Nebraska was favorable to woman, and much ahead of that passed in the same period by most of the older States. The records show that a few legislators treated any matter that referred to the rights of woman as a jest, but the majority were liberal or respectful, and the honored names of Dailey, Reavis, Majors, Porter, Kelley, and others, constantly recur in the records of the earlier sessions as pushing favorable legislation for women. At almost every session, too, the actual question of the ballot for woman was broached. The legislature of 1869 bestowed school suffrage on women;* and a joint resolution and a memorial to congress relative to female suffrage were introduced. The journals show that:

Hon. Isham Reavis of Falls City, introduced in the Senate January 30, a memorial and joint resolution to congress, on the subject of female suffrage. After the second reading, on motion of Mr. Majors, it was referred to a select committee of bachelors, consisting of Senators Gere, Majors, Porter, and Goodwill, who reported it back without recommendation. It was afterwards considered in committee of the whole, then taken up by the Senate. Reavis moved it be taken up for third reading on the following day. The yeas and nays being demanded the motion was lost by a vote of 6 to 7. On motion of Mr. Stevenson the matter was referred to the Judiciary Committee, with the usual result of neglect and oblivion.

In the autumn of 1867 Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony lectured in Omaha and sowed seed which bore fruit in the large number of petitions sent later from that city. In December 1870, Mrs. Tracy Cutler gave several addresses in Lincoln. Miss Anthony lectured January 28, 1871, on "The False Theory," and before leaving the city looked in on the legislature, which promptly extended to her the privilege of the floor. A number of ladies met Miss Anthony for consultation, and took the initiatory steps for forming a State association. A meeting was appointed for the following Friday, when it was decided to memorialize the legislature. The memorial was headed by Mrs. Lydia Butler, wife of the governor of the State, who spent some days in securing signatures. A lively pen-picture of those times is furnished by private correspondence of Mrs. Esther L. Warner of Roca:

The first work done for woman suffrage in Lincoln was in December, 1870. Mrs. Tracy Cutler stopped when on her way to California, and gave several addresses in Lincoln. Her womanliness and logic won and convinced her hearers, and had a

* The legislature of 1875 repealed this law except so far as it referred to unmarried adult women and widows. In the legislature of 1881, Senator C. H. Gere introduced a bill revising the laws relating to schools. One of the provisions of the bill conferred the school ballot on women on the same terms as on men—viz: Any person having children of school age, or having paid taxes on personal property, or being assessed on real estate, within such a period, is entitled to vote at all elections pertaining to schools. This, however, does not include the power to vote for State or county superintendents. The women of the State now vote so largely that it is no longer a matter of comment or record.

Digitized by Google

marked effect upon public sentiment. There are men and women to-day in Nebraska who date their conversion to the cause of equal rights from those lectures. Some steps were taken towards organization, but the matter was dropped in its incipient stages. During the same winter Miss Susan B. Anthony lectured in Lincoln, and presented a petition to be signed by women, asking to be allowed to vote under the fourteenth amendment. She also called a meeting of ladies in a hotel parlor and aided in organizing a State suffrage society. Her rare executive ability accomplished what other hands would have failed to do, for the difficulties in the way of such a movement at that early day were great. Lydia Butler, wife of Governor Butler, was elected president, and other representative women filled the various offices, but after a short time it was deemed wise to disband, as circumstances made it impossible to keep up an efficient organization. Time and money were not plentiful with western women, but we did what we could, and sent a petition to the legislature that winter asking a resolution recommending to the coming State convention to omit the word "male" from the constitution. The petition was signed by about 1,000 women, and received respectful attention from the legislature, and speeches were made in its favor by several members. Among others the speaker of the House, F. M. McDougal, favored the resolution. Governor Butler sent a special message with the petition, recommending the passage of the resolution, for which Nebraska women will always honor him.

Next it was thought best to call a convention in the interest of woman suffrage, to be held while the constitutional convention should be in session the coming summer. Two women were commissioned to prepare the call and present it for the signatures of members of the legislature who favored the measure. It was thought this course would give dignity and importance to the call which would secure attention throughout the State. The session of the legislature was very exciting. Intrigue accomplished the impeachment of a high State official, and others were being dragged down. As it neared its close the political cauldron boiled and bubbled with redoubled violence. It was more than any woman dared do to approach it. Were not the political fortunes and the sacred honor (?) of men in jeopardy? Woman's rights sunk into insignificance. We subsided. Our hour had not yet come.

Mrs. Butler says of the part she took at this time: "I entertained the speakers because requested to, and found them so pleasant and persuasive that I soon became a convert to their views. The active and intelligent leaders at that time were Mesdames Cropsey, Galey, Warner, Monell, Coda, and many others whose names I cannot recall." As the result of the effort thus made the legislature of 1871 memorialized the constitutional convention relative to submitting the question to the electors. The proceedings given in the journals are as follows:

February 4, 1871, Mr. J. C. Myers announced that ladies were in the gallery, and desired to present a petition. A committee was appointed to wait on them. D. J. Quimby introduced a resolution asking an opinion of the attorney-general as to whether in accepting the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments we grant the right of suffrage to women. It was carried, and the memorial, the opinion, and the governor's message were referred to the judiciary committee, which reported through Mr. Galey as follows:

Whereas, The constitution of the State of Nebraska prohibits the women of said State from exercising the right of the elective franchise; and

Whereas, Taxation without representation is repugnant to a republican form of government, and applies to women as well as all other citizens of this State; and

Whereas, All laws which make any distinction between the political rights and privileges of males and females are unbecoming to the people of this State in the year 1871 of the world's progress, and tend only to deprive the latter of the means necessary for their own protection in the various pursuits and callings of life. Therefore be it

Resolved, By the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, that the constitutional convention to be begun and holden on the — day of May, 1871, for the

Digitized by Google

purpose of revising and amending the constitution of said State, is hereby most respectfully and earnestly requested to draft such amendment to the constitution of this State as will allow the women thereof to exercise the right of the elective franchise and afford to them such other and further relief as to that honorable body may be deemed wise, expedient and proper; and be it further

Resolved, That said convention is hereby most respectfully and earnestly requested to make such provision (when said amendment shall be submitted to a vote of the people of said State) as will enable the women of Nebraska to vote at said election for the adoption or rejection of the same.

Resolved, Further, that the Secretary of State is hereby instructed to present a copy of this resolution to said convention as soon as the same shall be convened.

Mr. Porter moved the adoption of the report, which was carried by a vote of 19 to 16.* In the Senate, March 22, E. C. Cunningham offered the following amendment to the bill providing for calling a constitutional convention:

That the electors of the State be and are hereby authorized and recommended to vote for and against female suffrage at the election for members of the constitutional convention. Provided, That at such election all women above the age of 21 years, possessing the qualifications required of male electors are hereby authorized and requested to vote upon said proposition, and for the purpose of receiving their votes a separate polling place shall be provided.

The amendment was lost by a vote of 6 to 6.†

In accordance with the memorial of the legislature, the constitutional convention that met in the following summer by a vote of 30 to 13‡ submitted a clause relative to the right of suffrage. The constitution itself was rejected by the voters; and on this clause the ballot stood, for, 3,502; against, 12,676. Had it been carried at the polls, it would only have conferred upon the legislature the right to submit amendments, and it was therefore no special object to the adherents of impartial suffrage to make efforts for its adoption, while the fact that it was the outgrowth of the discussion of that principle brought upon it all the opposition that a clause actually conferring the ballot would have insured. The right of woman to the elective franchise was championed by the ablest men in the convention. Night after night the question was argued *pro* and *con*. Petitions from Lincoln and Omaha were numerously presented. The galleries were filled with women eagerly watching the result. The proposition finally adopted did not touch the point at issue, but was accepted as all that could be obtained on that occasion. As the constitution was not adopted, the succeeding legislature felt no interest in the proceedings of the convention, and the journals were not printed; and the records of this battle for justice and civil liberty were hidden in the dusty archives of the state-house until brought out to tell their story for these pages. As this is the only discussion of the question by Nebraska statesmen which has been officially preserved, and as the debaters were among the most promi-

* The following named representatives voted "yea": Messrs. Ahmanson, Cannon, Doone, Galey, Goodin, Hall, Jenkins, Kipp, Majors, Myers, Nims, Patterson, Porter, Quimby, Rhodes, Ryan, Wickham, Riordan, Roberts—19. Voting "nay": Messrs. Briggs, Beall, E. Clark, J. Clark, Dillon, Duby, Grenell, Hudson, Munn, Overton, Reed, Rosewater, Rouse, Schock, Shook, Sommerlad—16.

† Voting in the affirmative: Messrs. Gerrard, Hascall, Kennedy, Tucker, Tennant, and Mr. President—6. Voting in the negative: Messrs. Brown, Hawke, Hillon, Metz, Sheldon, and Thomas—6.

‡ Voting "yea": Messrs. Ballard, Boyd, Campbell, Cassell, Estabrook, Gibbs, Gray, Hascall, Kenaston, Kilburn, Kirkpatrick, Lake, Lyon, Majors, Mason, Manderson, Maxwell, Neligh, Newsome, Philpott, Price, Robinson, Stewart Spiece, Shaff, Thomas, Tisdel, Towle, Wakeley, President Strickland—30 Voting "nay": Messrs. Abbott, Eaton, Granger, Griggs, Moore, Myers, Parchin, Reynolds, Sprague, Stevenson, Hummel, Vifquain, Weaver—13.

Digitized by Google

nent men of the State, and many of them retain that position to-day, a few extracts will be of interest:

The discussion began with the motion of Mr. I. S. Hascall to strike out "men" and insert "persons" in the clause "All men are by nature free and independent." The motion was lost. General E. Estabrook moved to add "Every human being of full age, and resident for a proper length of time on the soil of the Nation and State, who is required to obey the law, is entitled to a voice in its enactment; and every such person whose property is taxed for the support of the government is entitled to a direct representation in such government." Mr. Hascall moved that "man" be inserted in place of "human being." Mr. E. S. Towle desired to put "male" in the place of "man." General Estabrook, on being asked if his amendment was intended to cover "woman's rights," replied:

I take pleasure in making the amendment because it is a step in the right direction. Justice to woman is the keystone in the arch of the temple of liberty we are now building. That no citizen should be taxed without representation is an underlying principle of a republic and no free government can exist without it.

General Estabrook seems to have stood alone in considering that the principle of impartial suffrage properly belonged to the Bill of Rights. The amendments were lost. When the article on extension of suffrage was under discussion, General Estabrook opened the subject in a comprehensive speech, lasting all one evening and part of the next. He proved that women were citizens, citing the petitions to congress relative to woman's right to vote under the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, and the reports of the committee thereupon—one in favor and one opposed, but both agreeing that women are citizens. Then he showed what rights they were entitled to as citizens, quoting the Federal Constitution, Bouvier's Institutes and Law Dictionary, James Madison, Paine's Dissertation on the Principles of Government, Otis' Rights of the Colonies, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and others. Commenting upon these, he set forth that women vote in corporations, administer estates, manage hospitals and rule empires without harm to themselves and with benefit to everybody else. He made a special argument to the Democrats, reviewing the position of some of their leading men, and closed with saying, "This is the most important measure yet considered, because it contains a fundamental principle."

General Strickland then introduced a resolution that an article for woman suffrage should be submitted to the people, that the women should vote separately, and that if a majority of both men and women should be in favor, it should become a law. The member did not move this because he favored the principle, but because he felt sure the women would not vote for it. He could not understand what a woman could possibly want more than she had, having the privileges while man has the drudgery. He closed with the prophecy that in two years not a woman would vote in Wyoming.

General Charles F. Manderson followed. Taking the ground that the members were not in convention to look after the rights of the males only, he said: "Did we recognize the right of all the people to be represented, we should have to-day on this floor some persons sent here to represent the women of our State. Men do not represent women because they are not and cannot be held responsible by them. We have no more right to represent the women here than a man in Iowa has to go to congress and presume to represent Nebraska there." To illustrate the principle General Manderson instanced that in the New York Constitutional Conventions of 1801 and 1821, persons voted for delegates who had not the property qualifications to vote at ordinary elections. Even the black man was represented by delegates for whom he had voted. In presenting a petition from Lincoln with seventy names of women who desired to vote, General Manderson said he had made inquiries, and these were the names of the respectable, influential ladies of Lincoln, sixty-three of whom were married. He then reviewed the history and workings of woman suffrage in Wyoming, furnishing the highest testimony in its favor, and closed as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I envy not the heart or the head of the man, let him occupy what place he may, let him sit in a legislative body or wield the editorial pen, who is so

base as to denounce the advocates of this measure as demagogues, and to say that if the right is extended to woman, the low, the miserable, will outnumber at the polls the thousands of virtuous wives throughout this land who advocate this measure; the lie is thrown in his teeth by that noble woman, Mrs. Livermore, who did more service in time of war as a soldier battling for the right than did even my gallant friend, and did far more than myself. She inaugurated and carried in her mighty hand and guided by her mighty brain that Western Ladies' Aid Society, and helped by some means the Western Sanitary Association that did more than 10,000 armed men to suppress the late rebellion. The lie is hurled in the teeth of the vile slanderer by this petition from the honest, virtuous ladies of the city of Lincoln. If we have planted one seed, that will bring forth good fruit, God be thanked for that result.

Mr. Kenaston spoke in favor of the measure, and Judge Moore opposed it in a very witty speech, of which the principal points were that the members were to decide according to expediency, not right; that women had always consented to the government —never trampled the flag in the dust, but always rallied to its support. Judge O. P. Mason followed in opposition, also J. C. Myers, the latter claiming that for twenty years the advocates of woman suffrage have made little, if any, impression on the public mind. E. F. Gray had begun speaking in favor when Victor Vifquain moved the previous question. A lively debate followed this, but it did not prevail. Mr. Mason said: "If we hold the right on this question let us challenge discussion and meet the opposition. It is not a wasted time that sows the seed of truth in the brain." Mr. Manderson urged the number of petitions that had been sent in as a reason for full discussion. R. F. Stevenson said he was opposed to it in every form. A. L. Sprague was against submitting this question at any time, that neither by the laws of God nor of man were women entitled to vote. Seth Robinson would like to hear the social aspects of the question discussed. He said: "I would like, gentlemen, to show whether it would not have a tendency to regenerate our social system and make women as a class more efficient than they are." The motion for the previous question being lost a motion was made to strike out this section. While this was pending General Estabrook insisted that it should be re-committed, saying: "It is the only political question that has essential principle in it. There are not brains enough in this convention to show the justice of taxation without representation. Judge George B. Lake warmly seconded Mr. Estabrook's motion. O. P. Mason wanted the proposition to be submitted to both sexes separately. J. E. Philpott advocated woman suffrage in a comprehensive argument, In closing, he said:

I demand that suffrage shall be extended to females for the reason that they have not adequate representation in the electoral department. As evidence of this I cite the undeniable facts that in this State woman has not fair wages for her work—has not a fair field to work in. The law, with all its freedom, does not place her on the same footing as to property that it does males. She has no voice as an elector in the making of the laws which regulate her marital union, no voice in the laws which sever those ties. The motto of the State is "Equality Before the Law." This can no more be among us with women disfranchised than in our nation all men could be free and equal while there were more than 3,000,000 slaves.

A. J. Weaver spoke in opposition and was followed by Hon. I. S. Hascall, who based his advocacy of the principle on the rights that woman has as an individual:

Because we have started upon the wrong track, because women in the dark ages were in bondage, is no reason, when we have advanced to a higher civilization, that we should continue this barbarous practice. There is a higher point to reach and I want to see the people reach that point. I think that the American people are old enough in experience to bring order out of disorder, and that when the question arises they will meet it in such a way as will be satisfactory to all.

Mr. Stevenson spoke in opposition basing his argument on man's superiority to woman and closed with this remarkable prediction which has probably never been surpassed as a specimen of "spread eagle":

Finally, Mr. President, I really think that if the ballot were placed in the hands of woman the old American eagle that stands with one foot upon the Alleghanies and the other upon the Rockies, whetting his beak upon the ice-capped mountains of

Alaska, and covering half the Southern gulf with his tail, will cease to scream and sink into the pits of blackness of darkness amidst the shrieks of lost spirits that will forever echo and reëcho through cavernous depths unknown.

S. P. Majors advocated the measure, and in the course of the discussion, B. I. Hinman offered a burlesque resolution, proposing to change the duties and functions of the sexes by law, and John D. Neligh said:

The gentleman from Otoe (Mr. Mason) will get the commission of the Christian mothers, not *against* the right of female suffrage, but *for* universal suffrage. That will be a happy day—a day when we shall shine out as a nation more brightly than any other nation under the sun.*

The constitution of 1871 not having been adopted, it became necessary to present another to the people. Accordingly in the summer of 1875 delegates of the male citizens met in the capital city. No outside pressure was brought to bear upon them to influence their consideration of this subject. The grasshoppers had ravaged the State the previous year, cutting off entirely the principal crop of the country. Again in the spring of 1875, in some of the river counties, the young had hatched in myriads, and devoured the growing crops ere winging their way to their mountain home. Gloom overspread the people at the prospect of renewed disaster, and the dismal forebodings were realized even as the delegates sat in council, for at this time occurred the final appearance of the locust. As the people gazed into the sky and watched the silver cloud floating in the sunshine resolve itself into a miniature army clad in burnished steel, women forgot to be concerned for their rights, and the delegates thought only of completing their work with the utmost economy and speed.

The new constitution, however, was formed on a more liberal basis. Hon. R. B. Harrington, of Beatrice, in the Committee on Bill of Rights, substituted the word "people" for "men," and it passed without comment. An article on amendments was embodied in the constitution, the same in substance as the one defeated in 1871, under which, as was actually done in 1881, the legislature could present amendments relating to suffrage.

The question of adopting the article relating to qualifications of electors being before the convention, Judge Clinton Briggs of Omaha sat during the reading of the first clause, "every male," etc., meditating, as he related to a friend, on how many lives had been sacrificed and how many millions of money had been spent in getting rid of the word "white," which had made such an unjust restriction, and how easy it would be, by

* The gentlemen who advocated the measure most warmly, were among the ablest judges and jurists of the State. Of the opposition, Judge O. P. Mason experienced a change of heart, and ten years later appeared as a foremost advocate. General E. Estabrook of Omaha lent all his influence to the amendment in the late canvass, and Col. Philpott of Lincoln was also a warm advocate, often accompanying his zealous wife and other members of the effective and untiring Lincoln association to the school-house meetings held in all parts of Lancaster county. D. T. Moore was called out at a meeting in York in 1881, and came forward without hesitation, saying that he was in favor of woman suffrage. He related this incident: that on his return home from the convention of 1871, he found that his wife had been looking after his stock farm and attending to his business so that everything was in good order. He praised her highly, when she replied, "Yes, and while I was caring for your interests, you were voting against my rights." The reply set him to thinking, and he thought himself over on the other side. A. J. Weaver opposed the clause in a very bitter speech. The friends of the amendment in 1881 were given to understand that Mr. Weaver was friendly, but to prevent the foreigners having that opinion, Mr. Weaver translated the record of his opposition into German, and distributed the papers among the German voters. Having been elected to congress, he was one of only three Republican members who voted against the standing committee on woman's claims. These facts cost him a great many votes at the time of his reelection in 1884, and are not yet forgotten.

Digitized by Google

one dash of the pen, to blot out the word "male," and thus abolish this other unjust restriction. On the inspiration of the moment, he moved to strike out the word "male." R. B. Harrington relates that the motion of Judge Briggs, who had not before expressed his sentiments, and who had not consulted with the known advocates of the measure, so astonished the convention that it was some time before they could realize that he was in earnest. The friends rallied to Judge Briggs' support. Gen. Chas. F. Manderson—a member of this, as of the preceding convention—seconded the motion, and sustained it with a forcible speech. Mr. Harrington made a speech in its favor, and after a short and vigorous discussion it came to a vote, which showed fifteen for the motion and fifty-two against.*

About this time Nebraska was again visited by lecturers on woman suffrage, who found an intelligent class of people, who, with growing material prosperity, were kindly disposed toward progressive ideas. Mrs. Margaret Campbell lectured in Nebraska in 1875, at about fifteen places between Kearney and the Missouri. In 1877–8 and 9, Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony lectured at many points. These, with some local lectures aroused an intelligent interest in equal rights for women. It was attempted to give this expression in the legislature of 1879. Resolutions were introduced, favorable reports made and the subject treated with kindly consideration, but for lack of time, or some one deeply interested, nothing was accomplished.

The legislation of 1879 on the subject of equal suffrage originated with Senator McMeans and C. B. Slocumb of Fairbury. The former offered a petition from Thos. Harbine and 160 others, asking a constitutional amendment prohibiting the disfranchising of citizens on account of sex. Referred to a committee of whom a majority recommended that its consideration be indefinitely postponed. A minority report was brought in by Orlando Tefft and Chas. H. Brown recommending that the prayers of petitioners be granted. In the House, at the same session, C. B. Slocumb presented the petition of Calvin F. Steele and others, with a resolution asking that the committee on constitutional amendments be instructed to provide for the submission of an amendment conferring the franchise upon woman. The resolution was adopted, referred, and reported back with draft of an amendment. The committee were Messrs. True, Windham, Batty, Simonton, Mitchell, Sparks and Gaylord. On motion of Mr. True the joint resolution was ordered to first reading; no further mention appears of it.

The first suffrage society of the State was formed at Fairbury by Mrs. H. Tyler Wilcox, and although this organization lived but a short time, it secured petitions and drew the attention of legislators elect—Senator McMeans and C. B. Slocumb—to the general interest felt in Jefferson county. The second society was formed in Thayer county. The sisters, Mrs. Davis and Mrs. Cornell, of Alexandria, called a meeting, which resulted in organizing the Alexandria Free Suffrage Association, Sept. 27, 1878. Prof. W. D. Vermilion and E. M. Correll of Hebron, lectured before this society, but, most of the members living in the country, the meetings were given up when the cold weather set in.

* The debates of this convention were not reported for the economical reasons mentioned. The names of the honored fifteen are, Clinton Briggs, W. L. Dunlap, R. C. Eldridge, J. G. Ewan, C. H. Frady, C. H. Gere, R. B. Harrington, D. P. Henry, C. F. Manderson, J. McPherson, M. B. Reese, S. M. Kirkpatrick, L. B. Thorne, A. M. Walling, J. F. Zediker. Many of these were active friends of the amendment of 1881.

Digitized by Google

The first working society was that of Hebron, which was organized by Mrs. Stanton, April 15, 1879. The citizens were prepared for the undertaking. E. M. Correll, editor of the Hebron *Journal*, in editorials, in lectures by himself and others, had urged on women the dignity and importance of interesting themselves in their own behalf. The society had been encouraged by lectures from Miss Couzins and Mrs. H. T. Wilcox, the latter taking the ground then comparatively new, that woman's ballot is necessary for successful temperance effort. Meetings were kept up regularly and with increasing membership, and the Thayer County Woman Suffrage Association won a deserved triumph in being primarily connected with the origin and successful passage of the joint resolution of 1881. The legislators elected in 1880 were Senator C. B. Coon, and Representative E. M. Correll. Both these gentlemen were active members of the Thayer County Association, and after their election a committee waited on them, pledging them to special effort during the coming session.

Meanwhile a general favorable sentiment was growing. In noting this it would not be right to omit mention of Mrs. Harbert's "Woman's Kingdom," in the Chicago *Inter-Ocean*, which circulated largely among country readers. The Omaha *Republican* passed, in 1876, under the editorial management of D. C. Brooks, who, with his wife, had been prominent in the suffrage work of Michigan and Illinois. The favorable attitude of this paper, and the articles which Mrs. Brooks from time to time contributed to it, exerted a wide influence. In the winter of 1881, Mrs. Brooks established a woman's department in the *Republican* which crystallized the growing interest around the leadership of its editor. Letters were addressed to her from various sections of the State, urging immediate action. The following from Mrs. Lucinda Russell will show the interest felt:

TECUMSEH, Neb., December 4, 1880.

MRS. HARRIET S. BROOKS—*Dear Madam:* I have been shown a form of petition for the suffrage which you enclosed to Rev. Mary J. DeLong, of this place. Will you please inform me if this is to be the form of petition to be presented during the present session of the legislature? We wish the exact words in order that we may have it published in our local paper.

We think it best to call a meeting, even now at this somewhat late day, and send women to Lincoln who will attend personally to this matter. We have left these things neglected too long. Will you call on all women of the State who can do so to assemble at Lincoln during the session of the legislature, appointing the day, etc.? I think we would be surprised at the result. This town contains scarcely a woman who is opposed to woman suffrage. We know we are a power here; and we do not know but the same hearty support which Tecumseh would afford may exist in many towns throughout the State. All we need for good earnest work and mighty results is organization. L. R.

In accordance with these requests a meeting for conference was called at Lincoln, January 19, 1881, Mrs. Brooks presiding. A second meeting was held at the M. E. Church, January 22, and a Lincoln Woman Suffrage Association was formed. A mass convention was held January 26, and a State Association was formed next day:*

* The officers elected were: *President*, Harriet S. Brooks, Omaha; *Vice-President-at-Large*, Clara Bewick Colby, Beatrice; *Vice-Presidents*—First Judicial District, Mrs. B. J. Thomson, Hebron;

Digitized by Google

The meeting of January 26 was held in the opera-house and was presided over by Mrs. Franc E. Finch. The speakers were John B. Finch, Rev. Mary J. DeLong, Judge O. P. Mason and Mrs. Esther L. Warner. Reading and music filled the programme. Mrs. DeLong's address was in behalf of the prohibitory and suffrage amendments. Judge Mason's address was afterwards printed for distribution. It showed how forcible and eloquent the Judge could be when on the right side. It will be remembered that Judge Mason opposed woman suffrage in the constitutional convention of 1871. His closing sentences were:

The more intelligent and exalted the character of the electors in a government whose foundation rests upon the franchise, the more safe and secure are the liberties of the people and the property of that government. The higher the social and moral standard of the electors, the better will be the type of manhood that is chosen to make laws and administer the government. As you elevate the standard of intelligence, and increase the ability and intensify the power to recognize the right and a sense of obligation to follow it, you make sure the foundations of civil and religious liberty. You do more, you elevate the character of the laws, and better the administration in every department of government. It has been wisely said that government is best which is best administered.

Do as we will, however, forget the rights of others, treat them with contempt, summon to our aid the united efforts of great political parties, invoke statutory and constitutional law to aid us in the mad career, yet, let no one forget that God's balances, watched by his angels, are hung across the sky to weigh the conduct of individuals and nations, and that in the end divine wisdom will pronounce the inexorable judgment of compensatory justice.

Previous to all of these meetings Hon. E. M. Correll had introduced on January 13, H. R. 59, a bill for an amendment to the constitution striking the word "male" from qualifications of electors. This had given impetus to the friends of the measure and inspiration to the meetings. A vote of thanks was tendered Mr. Correll by both the State and Thayer County Associations. The bill not being technically correct, Mr. Correll introduced on February 3, a joint resolution of the same purport, H. R. 162. The committees of Senate and House on constitutional amendments gave a hearing that evening to the advocates of the measure:

Of the fourteen members of the committees, ten were present; the full number from the House and three from the Senate. Mr. Correll pressed the claims of the resolution in the first speech, and then introduced the different speakers representing the State association. Mrs. Harriet S. Brooks reviewed the progress of sentiment elsewhere and said that her acquaintance and correspondence in this State led her to think the time ripe for action of this kind. Mrs. Orpha Clement Dinsmoor argued the abstract right of it, saying:

It has now come to the question of absolute right—whether one class of people shall say to another: "You can come only thus far in the direction of liberty." We realize that woman must be educated to this new privilege, just as man has been educated to it, and just as this nation is now educating millions of the newly enfranchised to it. Feeling that in intellectual and moral capacity woman is the peer of man, I think that her actual steps forward in needful preparation have given her the right to say who shall rule over her.

Mrs. Jennie F. Holmes based her remarks on the added influence it would give women in securing wise legislation in matters of welfare to the home. Clara B. Colby answered questions of the committee. It was a most encouraging fact that every member of the committee, after the speakers had finished presenting the case,

---

Second, Mrs. E. L. Warner, Roca; Third, Mrs. A. P. Nicholas, Omaha; Fourth, Mrs. J. S. Burns, Scribner; Fifth, Mrs. C. C. Chapin, Riverton; Sixth, Mrs. D. B. Slaughter, Fullerton; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. Ada M. Bittenbender, Osceola; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Gertrude McDowell, Fairbury; *Treasurer*, Mrs. L. Russell, Tecumseh; *Executive Committee*, Rev. M. J. DeLong, Tecumseh; Mrs. Orpha C. Dinsmoor, Omaha; Mrs. J. C. Roberts, David City; Mrs. C. B. Parker, Mrs. J. B. Finch, Lincoln; Mrs. E. M. Correll, Hebron; Mrs. J. H. Bowen, Hastings.

Digitized by Google

spoke in favor of the amendment, except one, a Bohemian, who was suffering from hoarseness and induced his colleague to express favorable sentiments for him. These gentlemen all remained friendly to the bill until its passage.

Headquarters were established in Lincoln. Mrs. Brooks remained during the session, and Mesdames Holmes, Russell, Dinsmoor and Colby all, or most of the time, until the act was passed, interviewing the members and securing the promise of their votes for the measure:

The joint resolution went through all the preliminary stages in the House without opposition on account of the discretion of its advocates, the watchfulness of its zealous friends among the members, and the carefulness of Mr. Correll with regard to all pending measures. The bill was made a special order for February 18, 10:45 A. M., and Mrs. Brooks, Mrs. Dinsmoor and Mrs. Colby addressed the House by invitation. At the close of their remarks Mr. Roberts offered the following:

Resolved, That, as the sense of this House, we extend our thanks to the ladies who have so ably addressed us in behalf of female suffrage, and we wish them God-speed in their good work.

On motion of Mr. Howe the resolution was unanimously adopted. Mr. Correll moved that H. R. 162 be ordered engrossed for third reading. The motion prevailed. The final vote in the House, February 21, stood 51 for the amendment; 22 against.*

The passage of the bill had its dramatic features. Intense interest was felt by the crowds which daily gathered in the capitol to watch its progress, while the officers of the State association were extended the courtesies of the floor, and came and went, watching every opportunity and giving counsel and assistance at every step. On this eventful Monday afternoon but one of these was present, and she watched with anxiety the rapid passage of the bills preceding, which made it evident that H. R. 162 would soon be reached. Six more than the needed number of votes had been promised, but three of these were absent from the city. There were barely enough members present to do business, as important bills claimed attention in committee-rooms and lobbies. The last bill ahead of this was reached, and the friends hurried out in every direction to inform the members, who responded quickly to the call. One man pledged to the amendment went out and did not return, the only one to betray the measure.

The roll was called amid breathless interest and every one kept the tally. Church Howe, in voting, said: "I thank God that my life has been spared to this moment, when I can vote to extend the right of suffrage to the women of my adopted State." And C. B. Slocumb responded to his name, "Believing that my wife is entitled to all the rights that I enjoy, I vote aye." The last name had been called, and all knew that only fifty votes had been cast for the amendment, lacking one of the required three-fifths of all members elect. The chief clerk of the House, B. D. Slaughter, usually so glib, slowly repeated the names of those who

* Members voting in the affirmative were: Messrs. Abbott, Babcock, Bailey, Baldwin, Bartlett, Broatch, Brown, Cantlin, Carman, Cook, Cole, Correll, Dailey, Dew, Dowty, Filley, Fried, Graham, Gray, Hall, Heacock, Herman, Hostetter, Howe, Jackson of Pawnee, Jensen, Johnson, Jones, Kaley, Kempton, Kyner, Linn, McClun, McDougall, McKinnon, Mickey, Moore of York, Montgomery, Palmer, Paxton, Ransom, Reed, Roberts, Root, Schick, Scott, Sill, Slocumb, Watts, Wilsey and Windham—51. Voting in the negative: Messrs. Bick, Bolln, Case, Franse, Frederick, Gates, Hollman, Jackson of Douglas, King, Lamb, Laughlin, McShane, Moore of Otoe, Mullen, Overton, Peterson, Putney, Sears, Wells, Whedon, Ziegler and Mr. Speaker—22.

Digitized by Google

had voted and more slowly footed up the result. Two favorable members were outside; if only one could be reached! The speaker, who had just voted against the amendment, but was kindly disposed towards those interested in it, held the announcement back for a moment which gave Church Howe time to move the recommitment of the resolution. His motion was seconded all over the House, but just at this juncture one of the absent friends, P. O. Heacock, a German member from Richardson county, came in, and, being told what was going on, called out, "I desire to vote on this bill." He walked quickly to his place and, in answer to his name, voted "aye." The speaker asked Mr. Howe if he wished to withdraw his motion, which he did, and the vote was announced. The galleries cheered, and the House was in a hubbub, unrebuked by the speaker, who looked as happy as if he had voted for the bill. The members gathered around the woman who sat in their midst, shook hands and extended congratulations, many even who had voted against the amendment expressing their personal sympathy with its advocates.

The joint resolution was immediately sent to the Senate, where, after its second reading, it was referred to the Committee on Constitutional Amendments, who returned it with two reports:

That of the majority, recommended its passage, while the minority opposed it on the ground that it would be inadvisable to introduce opposing measures into the House and thus create new divisions in politics and a new cause of excitement; but principally upon the claim that in the territory where female suffrage had obtained "for a period of two years" the experiment had been disastrous, the "interests of the territory damaged in emigration," and the administration of justice hindered in the courts. This report was signed by Senators J. C. Myers and S. B. Taylor, who had persistently refused to listen to argument or information on the subject. As soon as the report was made, the senators were informed of their glaring mistake as to the length of time the women of Wyoming had voted, and information was laid before them proving that the results in that territory had been in every way beneficial,* but they refused to withdraw or change their report.

The parliamentary tactics and watchfulness of Senators Doane, Coon, Smith, White, Dinsmore, Harrington and Tefft carried the bill through the bluster of the minority to its final vote; by twenty-two for to eight against.† When Senator Howe's name was called he offered the following explanation:

The question of submitting this proposition to a vote of the people is not to be regarded as a pleasantry, as some members seem to think. However mischievously the experiment of giving the suffrage to women may operate, the power once given cannot be recalled. I have endeavored to look at the question conscientiously. I desire to keep abreast of all legitimate reforms of the day. I would like to see the moral influence of women at the polls, but I would not like to see the immoral influ-

* At this time the valuable information from Wyoming with which Nebraska was afterwards flooded; letters from Gov. Hoyt, editorials from leading papers of the territory, and testimony from every reputable source, had not been gathered; but two members of the House, J. H. Helm and Church Howe, had been residents of Wyoming, and these cheerfully gave their assurance that only good had resulted from the enfranchisement of the women of Wyoming.

† Those voting in the affirmative were: Messrs. Baker, Burns (of Dodge), Burns (of York), Coon, Daily, Dinsmore, Doane, Evans, Gere, Graham, Harrington, Morse, Perkins, Pierce, Powers, Smith, Tefft, Turner, Van Wyck, Wells, Wherry and White—22. Those voting in the negative were: Messrs. Ballentine, Cady, Ervin, Howe, Myers, Taylor, Turk and Zehrung—8. Two of these names cannot stand in the roll of honor without an explanation; for twenty votes indicate the full strength of the bill. The irrelevance of opponents was illustrated by Senators Morse and Pierce. The former in voting said, he had opposed the measure every step of the way, and now to be consistent he voted aye. Senator Pierce said he had been watching the other side of the capitol and nothing there seemed popular but whiskey and women, therefore, he voted aye!

Digitized by Google

also present, with several friends of the cause from abroad, including Hon. E. M. Correll, editor of the *Western Woman's Journal*, who was the "leader of the House" on the bill for submitting the suffrage amendment to the people. The evening was sultry and threatening, and Masonic hall was not so full as it would otherwise have been, considering both "promise and performance." The local attendance was representative, including quite a number of our leading citizens, with their wives, and the editors of our contemporaries the *Herald* and the *Bee*. The meeting was a very interesting one, more especially the "conversational" portion, in which free discussion was solicited. This was opened by Hon. E. Rosewater, who spoke in response to a very general call. His address of half an hour in length was marked by apparent sincerity, and was a calm and argumentative presentation of objections, theoretical and practical, which occurred to him against the extension of the franchise to women. It was replied to by Mrs. Colby, in a running comment, which abounded in womanly wisdom and wit, and incessantly brought down the house. Our restricted space will compel us to forego a report of the discussion at present. On the conclusion of Mrs. Colby's very bright and convincing remarks, Dr. McNamara addressed the convention in a brief speech of great earnestness, depth and power.

The last session was most interesting. The hall was nearly filled, and among the audience were representatives of many of our leading families. There was rather too much crowded into this session, but the convention "cleaned up" its work thoroughly, and the audience displayed a patient interest to the very end. Besides the address of Professor Clark, there was a masterly constitutional argument by Mrs. Clara B. Colby, which demonstrated that woman can argue logically, and can support her postulates with the requisite legal learning, embracing a knowledge of the common and statute law authorities from Blackstone down. The address abounded in historical and literary allusions which show its author to be a person of broad culture as well as an adept in "book learning." Following came another address from Mrs. Bloomer, in which she disposed—as he expressed, to Dr. McNamara's entire satisfaction—of the stock biblical argument down from Moses to Paul against "woman's rights" to act in the same spheres, and speak from the same platform with men. This address was given at the special request of several leading ladies of this city, and though the hour was late, it was received with unbroken interest, and was complimented with a special vote of thanks, moved by Mrs. Colby. Most interesting reports of district and local work were made by Mrs. Holmes, of Tecumseh, Mrs. Chapin of Riverton, and Mrs. Slaughter of Osceola. Dr. McNamara closed the convention with a few stirring words of exhortation to the ladies to go right to work from now on to November, 1882. He excused himself from a set speech with the promise that, if "let off" now, he would, at some future time, present a full expression of his views on the reform to which he has so earnestly pledged himself. The closing word in which the *Republican* would sum up the varied proceedings of the first State suffrage convention is the magic word success.

A second very successful convention was held at Kearney, October 19, 20. A score or more societies were represented by delegates and their reports were very encouraging.

The principal features of the programme were: Address of president, Harriet S. Brooks; welcome, Mrs. H. S. Sydenham; response, Mrs. A. P. Nicholas; addresses by Mrs. Esther L. Warner, Gen. S. H. Connor (whose name appeared among the votes of the opponents in 1875); Mrs. Orpha C. Dinsmoor, on "Inherent Rights"; L. B. Fifield, regent of the State University, on "Woman's Influence for Women"; and Rev. Crissman, resident Presbyterian minister, on "Expediency." Among the letters received was the following, addressed to Mrs. Dinsmoor, by Gen. Manderson, whose name has been mentioned as voting for woman's ballot in the constitutional conventions of 1871 and 1875:

OMAHA, October, 17.

Your esteemed favor inviting me to speak before the convention at Kearney, October 18, 19, upon the subject of the extension of suffrage to women, was duly received. I

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1934 L

Clara Bewick Colby

Digitized by Google

d
on,
ion,
ion of

uch zeal
men would
unt of their
e summer ad-
nions, fairs, and

Mr. Sattler, who gave
rs. M. E. Vandermark,
ke in English in the
t that he would do so
by request, when he
ne time he tried to
an wife. It was
ermans greatly

ewick Colby;
easurer, Lucinda
e Fifield, George B.
al Districts—First,
moor; fourth, Ada

Digitized by Google

have delayed replying to it until to day in the hope that my professional engagements would permit me to meet with you at Kearney. The continuing session of our District Court prevents my absence at this time. I would like very much to be with you at the meeting of your association. My desire, however, would be to hear rather than to speak. Ten years have passed since, with other members of the constitutional convention of 1871, I met in argument those who opposed striking the word "male" from the constitution of Nebraska. In those days "the truth was mighty and prevailed," almost to the extent of full success, for, as the result of our effort, we saw the little band of thirteen increase to thirty. I feel that there must be much of new thought and rich argument growing from the agitation of the last ten years, and to listen to those who, like yourself and many other members of your association, have been in the forefront of the battle for the right, would be most interesting. But I must, for the present, forego the pleasure of hearing you. I write merely to keep myself "on the record" in the good fight. Now, as ever, I favor the enfranchisement of women, the disfranchisement of ignorance. I would both extend and contract the right to vote in our republic; extend it so that intelligence without regard to color or sex should rule, and contract it so that ignorance should be ruled. If this be not the cure for the political ills that threaten the permanency of American institutions, then there is no cure. May Nebraska be the first of the States to apply the remedy.

Very respectfully yours, CHARLES F. MANDERSON.

The association sent out its scouts, and as a result a convention was held in quite the northern part of the State, at Norfolk, November 30 and December 1. This was much appreciated by the citizens, whose locality was at that time not much frequented by speakers on any topic.* The first annual meeting, held at Lincoln in February, 1882, found a large number of delegates, each with reports of kindred local work, ready to receive the record of this year of preparation. Everything indicated a favorable termination to the effort, as it became evident that all sections of the State were being aroused to active interest.

The address of the president, Mrs. Harriet S. Brooks, was entitled, "Work, Wages and the Ballot." It was a review of a lecture given earlier in the season by Chancellor Fairchild of the University, in which he had taken the ground that the work of women should not receive the same wages as that of men. Rev. Dr. McNamara and others spoke briefly and earnestly. Miss Lydia Bell, at the closing evening session, gave an address which, to use the words of the reporter, "for felicity of composition, strength of argument, and beauty of delivery, fully merited the special resolution of thanks unanimously given by the society." †

The work of organizing and lecturing was continued with as much zeal and efficiency as the busy days and limited resources of the women would permit. Many of the counties held conventions, took count of their friends, and prepared for a vigorous campaign. As the summer advanced, at picnics, old settlers' gatherings, soldiers' reünions, fairs, and

* The speakers of this convention were Clara Bewick Colby, acting president; Mr. Sattler, who gave the welcome; Ada M. Bittenbender, Esther L. Warner, Judge I. N. Taylor, Mrs. M. E. Vandermark, Rev. Haywood and Professor Wood of Nebraska City College. The latter spoke in English in the afternoon, and in German, his native tongue, in the evening. The announcement that he would do so drew a large number of his countrymen. One of these was allowed the floor by request, when he soundly berated (in German) the women as opposed to foreigners, while at the same time he tried to weaken Professor Wood's argument by saying it was to be attributed to an American wife. It was reported that the marked contrast between the speakers was commented on by resident Germans greatly to the disadvantage of their fellow-townsman.

† The officers elected were: *President*, Ada M. Bittenbender; *Vice-President*, Clara Bewick Colby; *Secretary*, Belle G. Bigelow; *Corresponding Secretary*, Gertrude M. McDowell; *Treasurer*, Lucinda Russell; *Executive Committee*, Harriet S. Brooks, E. M. Correll, Susie Noble Fifield, George B. Skinner, Rev. John McNamara, Jennie F. Holmes; *Vice-Presidents of Judicial Districts*—First, Barbara J. Thompson; second, Dr. Ruth M. Wood; third, Orpha Clement Dinsmoor; fourth, Ada Van Pelt; fifth, Mrs. H. S. Sydenham.

political conventions,—wherever a company of people had assembled, there interested women claimed an opportunity to present the subject to audiences it would otherwise have been impossible to reach. With but few exceptions, officials extended the courtesies asked.

During the summer of 1882, the work was greatly aided by the lectures of Margaret Campbell and Matilda Hindman; and during the month of September by Helen M. Gougar. The American Suffrage Association, at its annual meeting in 1881, elected Hon. E. M. Correll president, as a recognition of his services to the cause in Nebraska, and in 1882, it held its annual meeting in Omaha, September 12 and 13. Lucy Stone, H. B. Blackwell, and Hannah Tracy Cutler remained for some weeks, lecturing in the State, and were warmly received by the local committees. Ex-Governor John W. Hoyt, and Judge Kingman, of Wyoming, gave a few addresses. The National Association also held its annual meeting at Omaha, Sept. 26, 27, 28. A reception was given at the Paxton Hotel on the close of the last session. Following this, a two days' convention was held at Lincoln, from which point the speakers diverged to take part in the campaign.*

While those friendly to the amendment were laboring thus earnestly, the politicians held themselves aloof and attended strictly to "mending their own fences." After the act had passed the legislature, it was found that almost every prominent man in the State was friendly to the amendment. The bench and bar were especially favorable, while three-fourths of the press and a large majority of the clergy warmly espoused the cause. Leading politicians told the women to go ahead and organize, and they would assist in the latter part of the canvass. Thayer and Clay county Republicans endorsed woman suffrage in their platform, while Franklin county delegates were instructed to vote for no one who was not in favor of the amendment.

Previous to the session of the Republican State Convention, great hopes were entertained that this body would put an endorsement of the amendment in its platform, as a majority of the delegates were personally pledged to vote for such a measure. But the committee on resolutions was managed by a man who feared that such endorsement would hurt the party, and the suffrage resolution which was handed in, was not reported with the rest. On the plea of time being precious, the convention was maneuvered to pass a resolution that the report of the committee should not be discussed. The report was brought in at the last moment of the convention, and adopted as previously arranged, and the convention was adjourned, everybody wondering why a resolution relative to the amendment had not been presented. The Republican leaders feared that their party was endangered by the passage of the bill by the legislature, for it was very largely carried by Republican votes, and while individually friendly, they almost to a man avoided the subject.

* Most of the speakers spent several weeks in the State. Mrs. Helen M. Gougar, Mrs. May Wright Sewall, Mrs. Saxon, Mrs. Blake, Mrs. Harbert, Mrs. Shattuck, Mrs. Neyman, Miss Anthony, Miss Couzins and Miss Hindman were the principal National speakers, and their ability and zeal aroused the whole State. Mrs. Colby was indefatigable in her exertions from the moment the amendment was submitted to the end of the canvass. Mrs. Colby and Miss Rachel Foster organized the whole campaign throughout the State, and kept all the speakers in motion.—[S. B. A.

Digitized by Google

As the canvass progressed, it was comical to note how shy the politicians fought of the women to whom they had promised assistance. Judge O. P. Mason, who had agreed to give ten lectures for the amendment, and whose advocacy would have had immense weight, engaged to speak for the Republican party, and at every place but one, the managers stipulated that he should be silent on the amendment. Of the vast array of Republican speakers, had even those who had expressed themselves in favor of the amendment advocated it intelligently and earnestly, the result would have been different.

Due credit must be given to ex-United States Senator Tipton, Judge W. H. Morris, and a few others who lectured outside of their own counties, as well as at home, while David Butler, candidate for senator from Pawnee county, E. M. Correll of Hebron, C. C. Chapin of Riverton, Judge A. P. Yocum of Hastings, and doubtless a few others, regardless of their political prospects, advocated the cause of woman along with their own. The women of Nebraska will always cherish the memory of the enthusiastic young student from Ann Arbor, Michigan, who spent some months of the campaign in Nebraska, giving lavishly of his means and talents to aid the cause. Wilder M. Wooster was a bright, logical speaker, and his death, which occurred in 1885, cost the world a promising and conscientious journalist.

Towards the close of the campaign it became evident that the saloon element was determined to defeat the amendment. The organ of the Brewers' Association sent out its orders to every saloon, bills posted in conspicuous places by friends of the amendment mysteriously disappeared, or were covered by others of an opposite character, and the greatest pains was taken to excite the antagonism of foreigners by representing to them that woman suffrage meant prohibition. On the other hand, the temperance advocates were by no means a unit for its support.

The morning dawned bright and clear on November 5, 1882. The most casual observer would have seen that some unusual interest was commanding attention. Everything wore a holiday appearance. Polling places were gaily decorated; banners floated to the breeze, bearing suggestive mottoes: "Are Women Citizens?" "Taxation Without Representation is Tyranny!" "Governments Derive their Just Powers from the Consent of the Governed." "Equality before the Law," etc., etc. Under pavilions, or in adjoining rooms, or in the very shadow of the ballot-box, women presided at well-filled tables, serving refreshments to the voters, and handing to those who would take them, tickets bearing the words: "For Constitutional Amendment Relating to Right of Suffrage," while the national colors floated alike over governing and governed; alike over women working and pleading for their rights as citizens, and men who were selling woman's birth-right for a glass of beer or a vote. It looked like a holiday picnic—the well-dressed people, the flowers, the badges, and the flags; but the tragic events of that day would fill a volume.

The conservative joined hands with the vicious, the egotist with the ignorant, the demagogue with the venial, and when the sun set, Nebraska's opportunity to do the act of simple justice was gone—lost by a vote of

Digitized by Google

50,693 to 25,756—so the record gives it. But it must not be forgotten that many tickets were fraudulently printed, and that tickets which contained no mention of the amendment were counted against it, as also were tickets having any technical defect or omission; for instance, tickets having the abbreviated form, "For the Amendment," were counted against it. It will always remain an open question whether the amendment did not, after all, receive an actual majority of all votes cast upon that question. In this new State, burdened with the duties incident to the development of a new country, the women had done what women might do to secure their rights, but their hour had not yet struck.

On the following evening, the speakers of the National Association, who still remained in the State held a meeting * at the opera-house in Omaha, at which the addresses were in the main congratulatory for the large vote, making proportionally the largest ever cast for woman's ballot.

While history must perforce be silent concerning the efforts and sacrifices of the many, a word will be expected in regard to some of the principal actors. Looking back on these two eventful years, not a woman who took part in that struggle would wish to have been inactive in that heroic hour. It is an inspiration and an ennobling of all the faculties that they have once been lifted above all personal aims and transient interests; and for all who caught the true meaning of the moment, life can never again touch the low level of indifference. The officers of the State Association who were most active in the canvass are here mentioned with a word as to their subsequent efforts:

Mrs. Harriet S. Brooks, whose services have so often been referred to, after working in three States for the privileges of citizenship, is devoting herself to the congenial study of sociology, and her able pen still does service.

Ada M. Bittenbender was admitted to the bar May 17, 1882, and from that time until the election gave undivided attention to the duties of her office as president of the State Association. The campaign song-book, the supplement folded in the county papers, the columns of notes and news prepared for many journals in the State, the headquarters in Lincoln from which, with the assistance of E. M. Correll and Mrs. Russell, she sent forth documents, posters, blanks and other campaign accessories, sufficiently attest her energy and ability. She is now a practicing lawyer of Lincoln, and was successful during the session of the legislature of 1885 in securing the passage of a law making mothers joint and equal guardians of their children.

Mrs. Belle G. Bigelow of Geneva was an active and reliable officer during the canvass of 1882, and is now prominent in the temperance work of Nebraska.

Mrs. Lucinda Russell of Tecumseh, for two years the treasurer of the State Association, edited a department in the local paper in the interest of the amendment, was one of the campaign committee, and spared no effort to push the work in her own county. Her sister, Mrs. Jennie F. Holmes, was one of the most effieient members of the executive committee. She drove all over her own county, holding meetings in the school-houses. The efforts of these two women would have carried Johnson county for the amendment had not the election officials taken advantage of a technical defect in the tickets used in some of the precincts. Mrs. Holmes sustained the suffrage work in Nebraska through the two following years as chairman of the executive committee, was elected in 1884 to the office of president of the State Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and reëlected in 1885 to the same position.

* For further details of the closing scenes, see Vol. III. page 241.

Digitized by Google

Mrs. Orpha C. Dinsmoor of Omaha, as chairman of the executive committee during the first year (Mrs. De Long having resigned), contributed largely to the most successful conventions of the campaign. One of the most notable lectures given in the State was hers in reply to Chancellor Fairfield of the Nebraska University, on "Work and Wages." As it was known that the chancellor held the ground that woman should not be paid equally with man, even for the same work and the same skill, the Lincoln Woman Suffrage Association invited him to give his lecture on that subject, and Mrs. Dinsmoor to answer him on the following evening. Mrs. Dinsmoor is well known for her interest in education and scientific charity, and has, by appointment of the governor of the State, represented Nebraska at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections at its last two annual meetings. She is now the president of the Nebraska Woman's Board of Associated Charities.

Mrs. Barbara J. Thompson, of English birth, was one of the leading spirits of the Thayer County Society, and was active in holding meetings and organizing committees. Her principal service was by her ready pen, which furnished articles for a large number of papers. It is pleasant to reflect that one woman who worked so earnestly for the rights of citizenship in Nebraska has obtained them in her new home at Tacoma, Washington Territory.

Mrs. Gertrude McDowell of Fairbury lent her wit and wisdom to many conventions, was ready with her pen, and secured a thorough canvass in Jefferson county. She was the third president of the State Association.

Mrs. Mollie K. Maule of Fairmont laid by her law studies to serve on the executive board of the State Association. In company with Mrs. Susie Fifield and others, she held meetings in all the precincts of Fillmore county, securing a good vote. Mrs. Maule was elected president of the State Association in 1885.

Mrs. Jennie G. Ford of Kearney, for some time member of the executive committee, was one of the leading advocates in Buffalo county. Always aiding and inspiring others to effort, she was an incessant worker in the causes dear to her heart. She was president of the Nebraska Woman's Christian Temperance Union from 1882 to 1884. She died June 18, 1885, leaving in the hearts of all who had known her, tender memories of her beautiful life.

Miss Lydia Bell, a talented elocutionist of Lincoln, devoted some months to lecturing. Her great intellectual and rhetorical gifts made her a very effective speaker.

Dr. Hetty K. Painter was a graduate of the Pennsylvania Medical College in 1860. She was a physician in the army during the civil war, and her proudest possession is the badge which proves her membership in the Fifth Army Corps. Her practice and her infirmary at Lincoln did not prevent her helping largely the cause in which she felt so great an interest.

Mrs. Esther L. Warner of Roca was the only person actively engaged in the last canvass who had been connected with the effort of 1871. As vice-president of her judicial district, she spoke at many places, organizing wherever practicable. Her motherly face, and persuasive but humorous argument, made her a favorite at conventions. Coming to Nebraska in its early days, a widow with a large family, she purchased a large farm and devoted herself to its management, to the care and education of her children, and to the direction of the village school, being a member of the board of trustees for many years. She had not used tongue or pen for public service since her girlhood until this occasion enlisted her interest and proved her gifts.

Clara C. Chapin, *La Petite*, as she was called at conventions, or as a friend styles her, "the dear little English bud that blossomed on American soil," was one of the most zealous of our women, organizing, lecturing and arranging campaigns. She is at present very active in the temperance work, and is one of the editors of a State temperance paper, the *Republican Valley Echo*. An extract from a letter received from her in answer to inquiry will show the spirit that actuates this representative advocate of woman's political enfranchisement:

I never thought much about "woman's rights" until within the last five years—that is, *political* rights. I always had a strong sense of my responsibilities as a woman

and a mother (have three children), and realize that we need something more than moral suasion to make our influence practical and effective. My husband, though not what is called a "politician," has been sufficiently in politics for me to know just what power the ballot has, and to see the necessity of woman's work in that direction. I am happy to say that Mr. Chapin is heart and soul with me in this, and it is a wonder to us how any wife or mother, how any Christian woman can say, "I have all the rights I want."

Hoping to hold the vantage ground already gained, a State convention was held at Kearney, December 6, 7, the place being selected because Buffalo county had carried the amendment by a good majority.

The association held three formal sessions, which were well attended and very interesting. Speeches of encouragement and congratulation were made, plans for work discussed, and campaign reminiscences recounted. One of the most interesting that was given was that of Mrs. Beedy of Gardner precinct, who said that the women actively interested in the suffrage work talked socially on the subject with every man in the precinct. There were seventy-two votes, and only four against the amendment. Of these four persons, two could neither read nor write, a third could not write his own name, and the fourth could not write his name in English. All the delegates present reported that the social work had been a prime cause of such success as they had found. Mrs. Bigelow said that Geneva precinct stood ninety-eight for the amendment and ninety-eight against. At Fairmont sixty ladies went to the polls. They wore white ribbon badges on which was printed, "Are we citizens?" The general impression among those attending the convention was that the Association should petition congress for a sixteenth amendment, petition the Nebraska legislature for municipal suffrage, and make use of school suffrage to its fullest extent. The executive committee held four sessions, appointed a number of working committees, and attended to settling up the campaign business of the Association. The convention was considered a decided success in every way.

The annual meeting was held in January, 1883. Mrs. Gertrude McDowell was elected president. The usual business was transacted, and a special committee appointed to secure favorable legislation. In view of the fact that so much of the opposition had been based on the allegation that "women do not want to vote," a resolution was prepared for the immediate re-submission of a constitutional amendment with a provision making it legal for women to vote on its final ratification. The joint resolution was introduced by Senator Charles H. Brown of Omaha, and ably advocated by him and others, especially by Senator David Butler. It was lost by nearly a two-thirds vote. The Committee on Amendments gave a hearing to Lydia Bell, Clara C. Chapin and Clara B. Colby. The joint resolution was taken up in the Senate for discussion February 15. *Woman's Work* gives the record of the proceedings:

Senator McShane of Douglas moved indefinite postponement. Senator Brown of Douglas, who introduced the resolution, spoke against the motion and made a forcible historical argument for the bill. Senator McShane then spoke at length against the bill, basing his opposition to the enfranchisement of woman on the ground that it would be detrimental to the interests of the foreigner. Senator Schönheit of Richardson opposed the bill on the plea that it would mar the loveliness of woman in her domestic relations. Senator Reynolds of Butler favored the bill. He had voted against the amendment last fall, but he did it because he feared the women did not want the ballot, and he was willing to let them decide for themselves. Senator Dech of Saunders favored the bill in remarks showing a broad and comprehensive philosophy. Senator Butler of Pawnee made a magnificent arraignment of the Republican and Democratic parties, and an appeal to the anti-monopolists to oppose the monopoly

Digitized by Google

of sex. His speech was the longest and most earnest of the session. Several persons expressing a desire to continue the discussion, McShane withdrew his motion to postpone. The Senate adjourned, and on Friday morning it was moved and carried that this bill be made the special order for that evening. Accordingly, the chamber and gallery were filled. On motion, Mrs. Colby was unanimously requested to address the Senate in behalf of the bill. Senator Butler escorted her to the clerk's desk, and she delivered an extemporaneous address, of which a fair synopsis was given by the *Journal* reporter. Foreseeing the defeat of the bill, she said, in closing, "You may kill this bill, gentlemen, but you cannot kill the principle of individual liberty that is at issue. It is immortal, and rises Phœnix-like from every death to a new life of surpassing beauty and vigor. The votes you cast against the bill will, like the dragons' teeth in the myth of old, spring up into armed warriors that shall obstruct your path, demanding of you the recognition of woman's right to 'equality before the law.'" The grave and reverend senators joined in the applause of the gallery, and carried Senator Reynolds' motion "that the thanks of this Senate be returned to Mrs. Colby for the able, eloquent and instructive address to which we have listened"; but with no apparent reluctance, on Senator McShane's motion being renewed, they postponed the bill by a vote of 18 to 6.* Of the absent ones, Senator Dech was known to be sick, some of the others were in their seats a moment previous, and it is fairly to be presumed that they did not dare to vote upon the question. Of those voting aye, Senators Brown of Clay, and Walker of Lancaster had favored the bill in the committee, and the friends were counting on their vote, as also some others who had expressed themselves favorable. It is due to Senators Brown of Douglas and Butler to say that they championed the bill heartily, and furthered its interests in every possible way.

Conventions were held at Grand Island in May, at Hastings in August of 1883, and at Fremont August, 1884. The annual meeting of 1884 was held at York, and that of 1885 in Lincoln. At all of these enthusiasm and interest were manifested, which indicate that the idea has not lost its foothold. The *Woman's Tribune*, established in 1883, circulates largely in the State, and maintains an intelligent if not an active interest. When a new occasion comes the women will be able to meet it. Their present attitude of hopeful waiting has the courage and faith expressed in the words of Lowell:

> "Endurance is the crowning quality,
> And patience all the passion of great hearts;
> These are their stay, and when the hard world
> With brute strength, like scornful conqueror,
> Clangs his huge mace down in the other scale,
> The inspired soul but flings his patience in,
> And slowly that out-weighs the ponderous globe;
> One faith against a whole world's unbelief,
> One soul against the flesh of all mankind."

---

* *Yeas*—Brown (Clay), Brown (Colfax), Butler, Canfield, Conklin, Dolan, Dunphy, Harrison, Heist, McShane, Norris, Patterson, Rogers, Sang, Schönheit, Sowers, Thatch and Walker—18. Senator Butler voted with these for the purpose of being able to move a reconsideration. *Nays*—Bomgardner, Brown (Douglas), Conner, Dye, Filley and Reynolds—6. *Absent*—Barker, Brown (Lancaster), Case, Dech, Fisher, Harris, Kinkaid and Rich.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER L.

KANSAS.

Effect of the Popular Vote on Woman Suffrage—Anna C. Wait—Hannah Wilson—Miss Kate Stephens, Professor of Greek in State University—Lincoln Centre Society, 1879—The Press—The Lincoln *Beacon*—Election, 1880—Sarah A. Brown, Democratic Candidate—Fourth of July Celebration—Women Voting on the School Question—State Society, 1884—Helen M. Gougar—Clara Bewick Colby—Bertha H. Ellsworth—Radical Reform Association—Mrs. A. G. Lord—Prudence Crandall—Clarina Howard Nichols—Laws—Women in the Professions—Schools—Political Parties—Petitions to the Legislature—Col. F. G. Adams' Letter.

WE closed the chapter on Kansas in Vol. II. with the submission and defeat of the woman suffrage amendment, leaving the advocates of the measure so depressed with the result that several years elapsed before any further attempts were made to reorganize their forces for the agitation of the question. This has been the experience of the friends in every State where the proposition has been submitted to a vote of the electors—alike in Michigan, Colorado, Nebraska and Oregon—offering so many arguments in favor of the enfranchisement of woman by a simple act of the legislature, where the real power of the people is primarily represented. We have so many instances on record of the exercise of this power by the legislatures of the several States in the regulation of the suffrage, that there can be no doubt that the sole responsibility in securing this right to the women of a State rests with the legislature, or with congress in passing a sixteenth amendment that should override all State action in protecting the rights of United States citizens.

We are indebted to Anna C. Wait for most of the interesting facts of this chapter. She writes:

I watched with intense interest from my home in Ohio, the progress of the woman suffrage idea in Kansas in the campaign of 1867, and although temporary defeat was the result, yet the moral grandeur displayed by the people in seeking to make their constitution an embodiment of the principle of American liberty, decided me to become a citizen of that young and beautiful State. Gov. Harvey's message was at that time attracting much attention and varied comments by the press. For the benefit of those

Digitized by Google

who have not studied the whole history of the cause, we give the following extracts from his message, published February 9, 1871:

The tendency of this age is towards a civil policy wherein political rights will not be affected by social or ethnological distinctions; and from the moral nature of mankind and the experience of States, we may infer that restrictions merely arbitrary and conventional, like those based upon color and sex, cannot last much longer than they are desired, and cannot be removed much sooner than they should be. This consideration should give patience to the reformer, and resignation to the conservative.

Let us have a true republic—a "government of the people, by the people, for the people," and we shall hear no more the oligarchical cry of croaking conservatism calling for a "white man's government"—appealing by this, and like slogans of class and caste to the lowest and meanest principles of human nature, dangerous alike to real republicanism and true democracy. Expediency, that great pretext for the infringement of human rights, no longer justifies us in the retention of a monopoly of political power in our own favored class of "white male citizens."

In the summer of 1871, Mr. Wait and myself removed to Salina, where Mrs. Hannah Wilson resided. She was the only person in this section of Kansas I ever heard of doing any suffrage work between the years of 1867 and 1877. She was a woman of great force of character, and a strong advocate of suffrage. She was born in Hamilton county, Ohio, and came to Salina in 1870. After Miss Anthony lectured in that city in 1877, Mrs. Wilson circulated petitions to the legislature and to congress. She was also active and aggressive in the temperance cause. When she learned of the Lincoln *Beacon*, and its advocacy of woman suffrage, she wrote an article for the paper, and accompanied it with a kind letter and the price of a year's subscription. Mrs. Wilson was a Quaker, and in her dress and address strictly adhered to the peculiarites of that sect.

Miss Kate Stephens, professor of Greek in the Kansas State University, writes that she has made dilligent search during the past summer among the libraries of Topeka and Lawrence for record of suffrage work since the campaign of 1867, and finds absolutely nothing, so that I am reduced to the necessity of writing, principally, of our little efforts here in central Kansas. In the intensely interesting letters of Mesdames Helen Ekin Starrett, Susan E. Wattles, Dr. R. S. Tenney and Hon. J. P. Root, in Vol. II., all written since 1880, I find no mention of any woman suffrage organizations. Mrs. Wattles, of Mound City, says: "My work has been very limited. I have only been able to circulate tracts and papers"; and she enumerates all the woman suffrage papers ever published in America, which she had taken and given away. A quiet, unobtrusive method of work, but one of the most effective; and doubtless to the sentiment created and fostered by this sowing of suffrage literature by Mrs. Wattles, is largely due the wonderful revival which has swept like one of our own prairie fires over south-eastern Kansas during the past year; a sentiment so strong as to need but "a live coal from off the altar" to kindle into a blaze of enthusiasm. This it received in the earnest eloquence of Mrs. Helen M. Gougar, who has twice visited that portion of the State. All these writers express their faith in a growing interest in the suffrage cause, and, some of them, the belief that if the question were again submitted to a vote of the people, it would carry.

In our State suffrage convention, June, 1884, among the demands which

Digitized by Google

we resolved to make of our incoming legislature, was the submission of an amendment striking out the word "male" from the State constitution. For myself, I entertained no hope that it would succeed further than as a means of agitation and education. On reflection, I hope it will not be done. The women of Kansas have once been subjected to the humiliation of having their political disabilities perpetuated by the vote of the "rank and file" of our populace. While I believe the growth of popular opinion in favor of equality of rights for women has nowhere been more rapid than in Kansas, yet I do not lose sight of the fact that thousands of foreigners are each year added to the voting population, whose ballots in the aggregate defeat the will of our enlightened, American-born citizens. Besides, it is a too convenient way for a legislature to shirk its own responsibility. If the demand is made, I hope it may be done in connection with that for municipal and presidential suffrage.

The history of the woman suffrage organizations in Kansas since 1867, may be briefly told. The first owes its existence to one copy of the *National Citizen and Ballot-Box* subscribed for by my husband, W. S. Wait, who by the merest chance heard Miss Anthony deliver her famous lecture, "Woman wants Bread, not the Ballot," in Salina, in November, 1877. The paper was religiously read by Mrs. Emily J. Biggs and myself; although we did not need conversion, both being radical in our ideas on this question, we had long felt the need of something being done which would fix public attention and provoke discussion. This was all we felt ourselves competent to do, and the knowledge that nobody else in our section of the country would do it, coupled with the inspiration of the *National Citizen*, culminated, in November 1879, in sending to the *Saline Valley Register*, George W. Anderson, editor and proprietor, a notice for a meeting of women for the purpose of organizing a suffrage society. In response to the call, Mrs. Emily J. Biggs, Mrs. Sarah E. Lutes, and Mrs. Wait, met November 11, 1879, at the house of A. T. Biggs, and organized the Lincoln Auxiliary of the National Association. We elected a full corps of officers from among ladies whom we believed to be favorable, interviewed them for their approval, and sent a full report of the meeting to be published as a matter of news in the *Register*, which had given our call without comment. The editor had a few weeks previously bought the paper, and we were totally ignorant in regard to his position upon the question. We were not long left in doubt, for the fact that we had actually organized in a way which showed that we understood ourselves, and meant business, had the effect to elicit from his pen a scurrilous article, in which he called us "the three noble-hearted women," classed us with "free-lovers," called us "monstrosities, neither men nor women," and more of the same sort. Of course, the effect of this upon the community was to array all true friends of the cause on our side, to bring the opposition, made bold by the championship of such a gallant leader, to the front, and cause the faint-hearted to take to the fence. And here we had the discussion opened up in a manner which, had we foreseen, I fear our courage would have been inadequate to the demand. But not for one moment did we entertain a thought of retreating. Knowing that if we maintained silence, the enemy would consider us vanquished, I

Digitized by Google

wrote an article for his paper, quoting largely from Walker's American Law, which he published; and Mrs. Biggs also furnished him an article in which she showed him up in a manner so ludicrous and sarcastic that he got rid of printing it by setting it up full of mistakes which he manufactured himself, and sending her the proof with the information that if he published it at all, it would be in that form. It appeared the following week, however, in the first number of *The Argus*, a Democratic paper, Ira C. Lutes, editor and proprietor, in which we at once secured a column for the use of our society. About a dozen ladies attended our second meeting, at which the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, all the ladies present being allowed to vote:

WHEREAS, The local newspaper is adjudged, by common consent, to be the exponent of the intelligence, refinement, and culture of a community, and, in a large degree, the educator of the rising generation; and

WHEREAS, In one issue of the Lincoln *Register* there appears no fewer than forty-seven misspelled words, with numerous errors in grammatical construction and punctuation; also a scurrilous article headed "Woman vs. Man," in which the editor not only grossly misrepresents us, but assails the characters of all advocates of suffrage everywhere in a manner which shocks the moral sense of every true lady and gentleman in this community; therefore

Resolved, That this association present the editor of the *Register* with a copy of some standard English spelling-book, and English Language Lessons, for his especial use.

Resolved, That as he has been so kind as to offer his advice to us, unsolicited, we reciprocate the favor by admonishing him to confine himself to facts in future, and to remember that the people of Lincoln are capable of appreciating truth and common decency.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be furnished the editor of the Lincoln *Register*, with the books above named.

This was promptly done, and so enraged him that the following week he published a tirade of abuse consisting of brazen falsehoods, whereupon a gentleman called a halt, by faithfully promising to chastise him if he did not desist, which had the desired effect so far as his paper was concerned.

W. S. Wait bought the *Argus* at the end of four months, changed its politics to Republican, and its name to the Lincoln *Beacon*, in which I established a woman suffrage department, under the head of "Woman as a Citizen," with one of Lucretia Mott's favorite mottoes, "Truth for Authority, and not Authority for Truth"; and weekly, for six years, it has gone to a constantly increasing circle of readers, and contributed its share to whatever strength and influence the cause has gained in this portion of the State. In the summer of 1880, G. W. Anderson announced himself a candidate for the legislature. He had just before made himself especially obnoxious by shockingly indecent remarks about the ladies who had participated in the exercises of the Fourth of July celebration. At a meeting of the suffrage society, held August 6, the following resolution, suggested by Mrs. S. E. Lutes, were unanimously adopted:

WHEREAS, We, as responsible members of society, and guardians of the purity of our families and community, are actuated by a sense of duty and our accountability to God for the faithful performance of it; and

WHEREAS, George W. Anderson, editor and proprietor of the Lincoln *Register*, during his few months' residence in our county has, by constant calumny and scurrility,

Digitized by Google

both verbal and through the columns of his paper, sought to injure the reputation of the honorable women who compose the Lincoln suffrage and temperance associations, and of all women everywhere who sympathize with the aims and purposes which these societies represent; and

WHEREAS, His utterances through the columns of the Lincoln *Register* are often unfit to be read by any child, or aloud in any family, because of their indecency, we are unanimously of the opinion that his course is calculated to defeat the aims and purposes of Christianity, temperance and morality; therefore

Resolved, That whenever George W. Anderson aspires to any position of honor, trust or emolument in the gift of the voters of Lincoln county, we will use all honorable means in our power to defeat him; and we further urge upon every woman who has the welfare of our county at heart, the duty and necessity of coöperating with us to accomplish this end.

The above preamble and resolution appeared in the woman's column of the Lincoln *Beacon* the following week, and 250 copies were printed in the form of hand-bills and distributed to the twenty-three post-offices in Lincoln county. It did not prevent his election, and we did not expect it would, but we believed it our duty to enter our protest against the perpetration of this outrage upon the moral sense of those who knew him best. We ignored him in the legislature, sending our petitions asking that body to recommend to congress the adoption of the sixteenth amendment, to Hon. S. C. Millington of Crawford, who had come to our notice that winter by offering a woman suffrage resolution in the House. In 1882 Anderson sought a second indorsement as a candidate for the legislature, but that portion of the community which he really represented had become disgusted with him; he struggled against fate with constantly waning patronage for another year, when he succumbed to the inevitable and sought a new field, a wiser if a sadder man. His mantle has fallen upon E. S. Bower, whose capacity and style were graphically portrayed in caustic rhyme by Mrs. Ellsworth, making him the target for the wit of the women long after.

I have given more space and prominence to these two editors than they merit, but the influence of a local newspaper is not to be despised, however despicable the editor and his paper may be; and it takes no small degree of courage to face such an influence as that exerted in this county by the one in question, which, I am happy to say, has gradually dwindled, until to-day it is too trifling, both in extent and character, to deserve recognition.

Six years ago I do not believe there was a paper in the State of Kansas which contained a woman suffrage department, and we rarely saw any reference whatever to the subject; now, within a radius of fifty miles of Lincoln Centre, fully two-thirds of all newspapers published have a column devoted to suffrage or temperance, or both, edited by women. The reason this is not true of the press of the entire State is because our indefatigable corresponding secretary, Mrs. Bertha H. Ellsworth, has not yet had sufficient time to personally present the matter; but there has been such a growth on the subject that by the press generally it seems to be accepted as one of the living issues of the day. A very efficient agency in bringing about this desirable result was the printed column, entitled "Concerning Women," sent out gratis every week dur-

Digitized by Google

ing the year 1882, by Mrs. Lucy Stone, from the office of *The Woman's Journal*, to all newspapers that would publish it. Many Kansas editors availed themselves of this generous offer, greatly to the advantage of their patrons and themselves.

But to return to the Lincoln Woman Suffrage Association. The first year our membership increased to twenty-seven; the second, to forty, including six gentlemen. We did not invite gentlemen to join the first year; owing to the character and attitude of the opposition, we preferred to demonstrate our ability to conduct the affairs of the society without masculine assistance. During our six years' existence we have enrolled eighty members, eighteen of whom are gentlemen. Of this number, forty-five women and fourteen men still reside in Lincoln county. We have held, on an average, one parlor meeting a month and ten public meetings.

In 1880, Mesdames Emily J. Biggs, Mary Crawford, Bertha H. Ellsworth and myself were assigned places on the programme for the Fourth of July celebration, after solicitation by a committee from our society. To me was assigned the reading of the Declaration of Independence, and I embraced the opportunity of interspersing a few remarks not found in that honored document, to the delight of our friends and the disgust of our foes. The other ladies all made original, excellent and well-timed addresses. In 1881 we got up the Fourth of July celebration * ourselves, and gave the men half the programme without their asking for it. In 1883 we had a "Foremothers' Day" celebration, and confined the programme to our own society. In September, 1882, the society sent the writer as delegate to the annual meeting of the National Woman Suffrage Association, held at Omaha, Nebraska; and in March, 1884, we sent Bertha H. Ellsworth to the Washington convention in the same capacity. Our society has taken an active part in the annual school district elections in Lincoln Centre. In the last five elections we have been twice defeated and three times successful. Our defeats we claimed as victories, inasmuch as we forced our opponents to bring out all their friends to outvote us. Fifty per cent. of all the votes cast at the last three elections were by women. Only twelve women in the town failed to vote in 1884. This increase is general all over the State; and, although we have only once tried in Lincoln Centre to elect a woman, and then failed, yet very

* In the centennial year, when protests were in order, the following was sent to the National Association at Philadelphia, describing the manner in which a lady eighty-four years old celebrated her birthday:

"NEUTRAL STATION, Kansas, July 17, 1876.

"DEAR SISTERS: Two days ago, on Saturday, the 15th, as has been usual for three or four years, a company of our friends and neighbors met at our house to celebrate my eighty-fourth birthday. We had a pleasant time. Some pieces, composed for the occasion, were read, and a clergyman made some appropriate remarks. I improved the opportunity to obtain the names of the ladies present, and succeeded with all, old and young, except one who was afraid it would get her into a trap; but with the rest it needed but little electioneering beside reading your advertisement to secure their names. We, as a neighborhood, are ignorant on the subject. I solicited assistance pecuniarily, and send you what I can, with a word of encouragement still to work and wait, and my earnest prayer for your final success. ELSIE STEWART."

The other signatures were: Henrietta L. Miller, Mrs. Julia A. Ingraham, Mrs. Hollet, Mrs. Lottie Griffin, Selinda Miller, Celina Lake, Mollie Yeates, Betsey J. Corse, Mary G. Hapeman, Mrs. Maggie Clark, Miss Elsie Miller, Louie Ingraham, Malura Hickox, C. A. Eddy, Anna Lowe, Charlotte H. Butler.

Digitized by Google

many of the country districts have one, some two women on the school-board, and at one time all three members in one district were women. That they are honest, capable and efficient is the verdict in every case.

In the spring of 1881, Mrs. Emily J. Biggs organized the Stanton Suffrage Society, eight miles from Lincoln Centre, with a membership of over twenty, more than half of whom were gentlemen. Mesdames Mary Baldwin, N. Good, T. Faulkner, M. Biggs, Mrs. Swank and others were the leading spirits. All their meetings are public, and are held in the school-house. Through this society that portion of the county has become well leavened with suffrage sentiment. Failing health alone has prevented Mrs. Biggs from carrying this school district organization to all parts of the county and beyond its limits, as she has been urgently invited to do. "Instant in season and out of season" with a word for the cause, she has, individually, reached more people with the subject than any other half-dozen women in the society. Her pen, too, has done good service. Over the *nom de plume* of "Nancy," in the *Beacon*, she has dealt telling blows to our ancient adversary, the *Register*. In October, 1882, the writer went by invitation to Ellsworth and organized a society* auxiliary to the National, composed of excellent material, but too timid to do more than hold its own until the summer of 1884, when Mrs. Gougar, and later, Mrs. Colby, lectured there, soon after which Mrs. Ellsworth canvassed the town with literature and a petition for municipal suffrage, which was signed by eighty of the eighty-five women to whom it was presented, showing that there was either a great deal of original suffrage sentiment there, or that the society had exerted a large amount of "silent influence." In October, 1883, Mrs. Helen M. Gougar came to fill some lecture engagements in the southeastern part of the State. During this visit she organized several clubs.†

In June, 1884, Mrs. Gougar again visited Kansas, lecturing for a month in different parts of the State. She drew large audiences and made many converts. A suffrage society was organized at Emporia, Miss M. J. Watson, president. The active friends availed themselves of her assistance to call a State Suffrage Convention, which met in the Senate chamber in Topeka, June 25, 26, and organized a State Association.‡ Mrs. Gougar, by the unanimous vote of the convention, presided, and dispatched business with her characteristic ability. In view of all the circumstances, this

---

* *President*, Mrs. Mary Maberly; *Secretary*, Miss Lillie M. Hull; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Emma H. Johns; and an able executive committee, of which Mrs. E. M. Alden, Mrs. Emma Faris, Mrs. Mattie McDowell and Bertha H. Ellsworth, who was then teaching there, were members.

† Arkansas City Suffrage Club, with Mrs. M. B. Houghton, *President;* Mrs. E. T. Ayers, *Vice-President;* Miss Gertrude Fowler, *Secretary*, and Mrs. F. Daniels, *Treasurer;* also one at Winfield, county-seat of Cowley county, with Mrs. J. Cairns, *President;* Mrs. M. R. Hall, *Secretary*, and Mrs. E. D. Garlick, *Treasurer;* and vice-presidents from each of the churches, as follows: Mesdames P. P. Powell, G. Miller, M. Burkey and J. C. Fuller.

‡ *President*, Mrs. Hetta P. Mansfield, Winfield; *Vice-President-at-Large*, Mrs. Anna C. Wait, Lincoln; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Bertha H. Ellsworth, Lincoln; *Recording Secretary*, Miss Georgiana Daniels, Eureka; *Treasurer*, Mrs. D. A. Millington, Winfield; *Chaplain*, Rev. S. S. Cairns, Winfield; *Vice-Presidents* and *Executive Committee*, Mrs. Judge Griswold, Leavenworth; Miss Sarah Hurtsel, Columbus; Mrs. Anna Taylor, Wichita; Miss Myra Willets, Independence; Mrs. W. P. Roland, Cherryvalé; Judge Lorenzo Westover, Clyde; Mr. V. P. Wilson, Abilene; Hon. Albert Griffin, Manhattan; Mrs. A. O. Carpenter, Emporia; Mrs. Noble Prentis, Atchison; Mrs. S. S. Moore, Burden; Mrs. Emma Faris, Carnerio; Mrs. Houghton and Mrs. Farrer, Arkansas City; Mrs. Finley, Topeka.

Digitized by Google

convention and its results were highly satisfactory. The attendance was not large, but the fact that the call was issued from Topeka to the press of the State but eight days before the convention met, and probably did not reach half the papers in time for one insertion, accounts for the absence of a crowd. Some even in Topeka learned that the convention was in progress barely in time to reach its last session. Reporters for the Topeka *Capital*, the Topeka *Commonwealth* and Kansas City *Journal* attended all the day sessions of the convention, and gave full and fair reports of the proceedings. After the adjournment of the State convention, the women of Topeka formed a city society. The corresponding secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth, with Mrs. Clara B. Colby, made an extensive circuit, lecturing and organizing societies. They were everywhere cordially welcomed.*

Kansas has a flourishing Women's Christian Temperance Union which at its last annnal meeting adopted a strong woman suffrage resolution; Miss O. P. Bray of Topeka is its superintendent of franchise. Mrs. Emma Molloy of Washington, both upon the rostrum and through her paper, the official organ of the State Union, ably and fearlessly advocates woman suffrage as well as prohibition, and makes as many converts to the former as to the latter.

Mrs. A. G. Lord did a work worthy of mention in the formation of the Radical Reform Christian Association, for young men and boys, taking their pledge to neither swear, use tobacco nor drink intoxicating liquors. A friend says of Mrs. Lord:

> Like all true reformers she has met even more than the usual share of opposition and persecution, and mostly because she is a woman and a licensed preacher of the Methodist church in Kansas. She was a preacher for three years, but refuses to be any longer because, she says, under the discipline as it now is, the church has no right to license a woman to preach. Trying to do her work inside the church in which she was born and reared, she has had to combat not only the powers of darkness outside the church, but also the most contemptible opposition, amounting in several instances to bitter persecutions, from the ministers of her own denomination with whom she has been associated in her work as a preacher; and through it all she has toiled on, manifesting only the most patient, forgiving spirit, and the broadest, most Christ-like charity.

The R. R. C. A. has been in existence two and a half years, and has already many hundreds of members in this and adjoining counties, through the indefatigable zeal of its founder. Mitchell county has the honor of numbering among its many enterprising women the only woman who is a mail contractor in the United States, Mrs. Myra Peterson, a native of New Hampshire. The *Woman's Tribune* of November, 1884, contains the following brief sketch of a grand historic character:

> Marianna T. Folsom is lecturing in Kansas on woman suffrage. She gives an interesting account of a visit to Mrs. Prudence Crandall Philleo. Miss Crandall over

* The towns visited were: Beloit, Lincoln Center, Wilson, Ellsworth, Salina, Solomon City, Minneapolis, Cawker City and Clyde. The officers of the Topeka society were: *President*, Mrs. Priscilla Finley; *Secretary*, Mrs. E. G. Hammon; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Sarah Smith. The officers of Beloit were: *President*, Mrs. H. Still; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. J. M. Patten, Mrs. M. Vaughan; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. F. J. Knight; *Recording Secretary*, Mary Charlesworth; *Treasurer*, Mrs. M. Bailey. At Salina, Mrs. Johns and Mrs. Christina Day are the officers.

Digitized by Google

[illegible]

In the introduction to Chapter VII, Vol. I, of this history [illegible] "Tick Clarina Howard Nichols," the woman [illegible] indebted for many civil rights which they have as yet [illegible] Unusual hesitancy as this statement is, I must [illegible] is applied to a large majority of our women of [illegible] should have availed themselves of the privilege [illegible] what the devotion of Mrs. Nich[illegible] [illegible] done this, nor tried to enlighten the [illegible] out the State, the great mass of whom are of [illegible] body and mind to furnish food, clothing [illegible] children. Probably fully four-fifths of [illegible] Kansas never have heard of Clarina Howard Nichols [illegible] do know that our laws favor women more [illegible] other States, and largely as a [illegible] the school [illegible] with which the rank and file of our women [illegible] is presented to them, indicates that their inaction [illegible] from apathy and indifference as from a lack of means [illegible] Among all the members of all the woman suffrage [illegible] Kansas, I know of but just one woman of leisure—one who [illegible] make a personal sacrifice of some kind each time she attends a [illegible] pays a dollar into the treasury. Section 6, Article XV, [illegible] Kansas reads:

> [illegible] provide for the protection of the rights of [illegible] real, personal, and mixed, [illegible] provide for their equal rights in the possession [illegible] the true spirit of this section, our statute provides that [illegible] as regards the property of either husband or wife [illegible] the interest of one in the property of the other are the same [illegible] the common-law principle of estates of dower, and by courtesy [illegible]

The rights of husband and wife in the control of their [illegible] and personal are [illegible] as provided [illegible] 3, and 2, Chapter 62, page 539, Compiled Laws of Kansas, [illegible]

> SECTION 1. "The property, real and personal, which any woman [illegible] of her marriage, and the rents, issues, profits, and [illegible]

> [illegible] Kansas [illegible] Clarina Howard Nichols [illegible] Wyandotte [illegible] they [illegible] the senders, the only [illegible]

[illegible] Page XXXII.

Digitized by Google

The world needs women who
do their own thinking.
Cordially Yours.
Helen M. Gougar

Digitized by Google

fifty years ago allowed a girl with colored blood in her veins to attend her young ladies' school in Connecticut. On account of the social disturbance because of this, she dismissed the white girls and made her school one for colored pupils. Protests were followed by indictments, and these by mobbings, until she was obliged to give up her school. For her fortitude, the Anti-Slavery Society had her portrait painted. It became the property of Rev. Samuel J. May, who donated it to Cornell University when opened to women. Miss Crandall married, but has now been a widow many years. She is in her eighty-third year, and is vigorous in mind and body, having been able to deliver the last Fourth of July oration at Elk Falls, Kan., where she now lives and advocates woman suffrage and temperance.

In the introduction to Chapter VII., Vol. I., of this history, appears this sentence: "To Clarina Howard Nichols * the women of Kansas are indebted for many civil rights which they have as yet been too apathetic to exercise." Uncomplimentary as this statement is, I must admit its truthfulness as applied to a large majority of our women of culture and leisure, those who should have availed themselves of the privileges already theirs and labored for what the devotion of Mrs. Nichols made attainable. They have neither done this, nor tried to enlighten their less favored sisters throughout the State, the great mass of whom are obliged to exert every energy of body and mind to furnish food, clothes and shelter for themselves and children. Probably fully four-fifths of the women of Kansas never have heard of Clarina Howard Nichols; while a much larger number do know that our laws favor women more than those of other States, and largely avail themselves of the school ballot. The readiness with which the rank and file of our women assent to the truth when it is presented to them, indicates that their inaction results not so much from apathy and indifference as from a lack of means and opportunity. Among all the members of all the woman suffrage societies in Central Kansas, I know of but just one woman of leisure—one who is not obliged to make a personal sacrifice of some kind each time she attends a meeting or pays a dollar into the treasury. Section 6, Article XV., of the constitution of Kansas reads:

The legislature shall provide for the protection of the rights of women, in acquiring and possessing property, real, personal, and mixed, separate and apart from her husband; and shall also provide for their equal rights in the possession of their children. In accordance with the true spirit of this section, our statute provides that the law of descents and distributions as regards the property of either husband or wife is the same; and the interests of one in the property of the other are the same with each; and that the common-law principles of estates of dower, and by courtesy are abolished.†

The rights of husband and wife in the control of their respective properties, both real and personal, are identical, as provided for in sections 1, 2, 3, and 4. Chapter 62, page 539, compiled laws of Kansas, 1878:

SECTION 1. The property, real and personal, which any woman in this State may own at the time of her marriage, and the rents, issues, profits, and proceeds thereof,

* The women of Kansas should never forget that to the influence of Mrs. Nichols in the Constitutional convention at Wyandotte, they owe the modicum of justice secured by that document. With her knitting in hand, she sat there alone through all the sessions, the only woman present, watching every step of the proceedings, and laboring with members to so frame the constitution as to make all citizens equal before the law. Though she did not accomplish what she desired, yet by her conversations with the young men of the State, she may be said to have made the idea of woman suffrage seem practicable to those who formed the constitution and statute laws of that State.—[E. C. S.

† See compiled laws of Kansas, 79, page 378, chapter XXXIII.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

fifty years ago allowed a girl with colored blood [illegible] ladies' school in Connecticut. On account of [illegible] she dismissed the white girls and made h[illegible] were followed by indictments, and the[illegible] her school. For her fortitude, the [illegible] became the property of Rev. [illegible] when opened to women. [illegible] years. She is in her e[illegible] been able to deliver th[illegible] lives and advocates [illegible]

In the intro[illegible] this sentence [illegible] indebted fo[illegible] exercise." [illegible] fulness [illegible] those [illegible] and [illegible] The [illegible] si[illegible] [illegible] d children. Probably fully [illegible] have heard of Carina Howard Nichols [illegible] do know that our laws favor woman more [illegible] es and largely avail themselves of the school [illegible] which the rank and file of our women [illegible] sented to them, indicates that their inaction [illegible] apathy and indifference as from a lack of means [illegible] ng all the members of all the woman suffrage [illegible] sas, I know of but just one woman of leisure—one wh[illegible] make a personal sacrifice of some kind each time [illegible] pays a dollar into the treasury. Section 6, Article XV, [illegible] as reads:

[illegible] provide for the protection of the rights [illegible] real, personal, and mixed, separate [illegible] provide for their equal rights in the possession of their [illegible] the true spirit of this section, [illegible] butions as regards the property of either husband or wife [illegible] and the interests of one in the property of the other are the same [illegible] the common-law principles of estates of dower, and by courtesy are [illegible]

The rights of husband and wife in the control of their respective [illegible] erties both real and personal are identical, as provided for [illegible] 3 and 4, Chapter 62, page 539, compiled laws of Kansas, 18[illegible]

SECTION 1. The property, real and personal, which any woman [illegible] the time of her marriage, and the rents, notes, profits and [illegible]

[illegible] Kansas [illegible] Wyandotte [illegible] the sessions [illegible] the [illegible] XXXIII.

The world needs women who
do their own thinking.
Cordially Yours.
Helen M. Gougar.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1914 L

and any real, personal, or mixed property which shall come to her by descent, devise, or bequest, or the gift of any person except her husband, shall remain her sole and separate property, notwithstanding her marriage, and not be subject to the disposal of her husband, or liable for his debts.

SEC. 2. A married woman, while the marriage relation subsists, may bargain, sell and convey her real and personal property, and enter into any contract with reference to the same, in the same manner, to the same extent, and with like effect as a married man may in relation to his real and personal property.

SEC. 3. A woman may, while married, sue and be sued, in the same manner as if unmarried.

SEC. 4. Any married woman may carry on any trade or business, and perform any labor or services, on her sole and separate account, and the earnings of any married woman from her trade, business, labor or services, shall be her sole and separate property, and may be used and invested by her in her own name.

It is a fact worthy of note that the above legislation, also the passage of the law of descents and distributions, immediately followed the woman suffrage campaign of 1867.

In 1880, the Democrats of Kansas, in their State convention at Topeka, nominated Miss Sarah A. Brown of Douglas county, for superintendent of public instruction, the first instance on record of a woman receiving a nomination from one of the leading political parties for a State office. The following is Miss Brown's letter of acceptance:

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, Douglas Co., Kansas,
LAWRENCE, Kansas, Sept. 30, 1880.

To Hon. John Martin, Topeka, Kansas, Chairman of the State Democratic Central Committee:

SIR:—I am in receipt of your communication of August 30, advising me of the action of the Democratic convention of August 26, in nominating me as their candidate for State superintendent of public instruction.

In making this nomination the Democratic party of Kansas has, with a liberal and enlightened spirit, and with a generous purpose, yielded to the tendency of the times, which demand equal rights and equal opportunities for all the people, and it has thus shown itself to be a party of progress. It has placed itself squarely and unequivocally before the people upon this great and vital question of giving to woman the right to work in any field for which she may be fitted, thus placing our young and glorious State in the foremost rank on this, as on the other questions of reform.

Furthermore, in nominating one who has no vote, and for this reason cannot be considered in politics, and in doing this of its own free will, without any solicitation on my part, the Democratic party of this State has shown that it is in full accord with the Jeffersonian doctrine that the office should seek the man and not the man the office; and also that it fully appreciates the fact which is conceded by all persons who have thought much on educational matters, that the best interests of our schools demand that the office of superintendent, both of the State and county, should be as far as possible disconnected from politics, and it has done what it could to rescue the office from the vortex of mere partisan strife. For this reason I accept the nomination, thanking the party for the honor it has conferred upon me. Respectfully, SARAH A. BROWN.

Miss Brown was defeated. The vote of the State showed the average Democrat unable to overcome his time-rusted prejudices sufficiently to vote for a woman to fill the highest educational office in the gift of the people, so that Miss Brown's minority was smaller even than that of the regular Democratic ticket.

January 21, 1881, Hon. S. C. Millington of Crawford county introduced in the House a joint resolution providing for the submission to the legal

voters of the State of Kansas of a proposition to amend the constitution so as to admit of female suffrage. The vote on the adoption of the resolution stood 51 ayes and 31 noes in the House, and a tie in the Senate. Later in the same session, Hon. A. C. Pierce of Davis county introduced in the House a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution which should confer the right of suffrage on any one over 21 years of age, who had resided in the State six months. Mr. Hackney of Cowley county, introduced a like resolution in the Senate.

In December, 1881, Governor St. John appointed Mrs. Cora M. Downs one of the regents of the State University at Lawrence. In 1873, Mrs. Rice was elected to the office of county clerk of Harper county, and Miss Alice Junken to the office of recorder of deeds, in Davis county. In 1885 Miss Junken was reëlected by a majority of 500 over her competitor, Mrs. Fleming, while Trego county gave a unanimous vote for Miss Ada Clift as register of deeds.

In proportion to her population Kansas has as many women in the professions as any of the older States. We have lawyers, physicians, preachers and editors, and the number is constantly increasing. In Topeka there are eight practicing physicians, holding diplomas from medical colleges, and two or three who are not graduates. In the Woman's Medical College of Chicago, Kansas now has four representatives—Mrs. Sallie A. Goff of Lincoln, Miss Thomas of Olathe, Miss Cunningham of Garnett, and Miss Gilman of Pittsburg.

All female persons over the age of twenty-one years are entitled to vote at any school-district meeting on the same terms as men.

The right of a woman to hold any office, State (except member of the legislature), county, township or school-district, in the State of Kansas, is the same as that of a man. In 1882, six counties, viz., Chase, Cherokee, Greenwood, Labette, Pawnee, and Woodson, elected women as superintendents of public instruction.

Section 23, Article II., Constitution of Kansas, reads: "The legislature, in providing for the formation and regulation of schools, shall make no distinction between males and females."

Under the legislation based upon this clause of our constitution, males and females have equal privileges in all schools controlled by the State. The latest report of the State superintendent of public instruction shows that over one-half of the pupils of the Normal school, about two-fifths in the University, and nearly one-third in the Agricultural College, are females.

In the private institutions of learning, including both denominational and unsectarian, over one-half of the students are females who study in the same classes as the males, except in Washburn college which has a separate course for ladies.

Most of these institutions have one woman, or more, in their faculties. One-half of the faculty of the State University is composed of women. In the last report of the State superintendent is the following:

The ratio of female teachers is greater than ever before, some 69 per cent. of the entire number employed. It is, indeed, a matter of congratulation that the work of

Digitized by Google

the schools, especially the primary teaching, is falling more and more to the care of women.

The Republican State convention of 1882, by an overwhelming majority endorsed woman suffrage, which action the Lincoln W. S. A. promptly recognized as follows:

WHEREAS, The Republican party of the State of Kansas, by and through its chosen representatives in the Republican State convention at Topeka, August 9, 1882, did, by an overwhelming majority, pledge itself to the support of the principle of woman suffrage by the following:

Resolved, That we request the next legislature to submit such an amendment to the constitution of the State as will secure to woman the right of suffrage. And,

WHEREAS, By this action the Republican party of Kansas has placed itself in line with the advanced thought of the times in a manner worthy a great political party of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, thereby proving itself worthy the respect and confidence of the women of the State; therefore,

Resolved, That the Lincoln Woman Suffrage Association, in behalf of the women of Kansas, does hereby express thanks to the Republican party for this recognition of the political rights of the women of the State, and especially to the Hon. J. C. Root of Wyandotte, Hon. Hackney of Winfield, Col. Graves of Montgomery, and Gen. Kelly, for their able and fearless support of the measure, and to each and every member of the convention who voted for it.

In 1883, Senator Hackney introduced a bill of which we find the following in the *Topeka Capital* of that date:

Senate bill No. 46, being Senator Hackney's, an act to provide for the submission of the question of female suffrage to the women of Kansas, was taken up, the reading thereof being greeted with applause. It provides that at the general election in 1883 the women of the State shall decide, by ballot, whether they want suffrage or not. Senator Hackney made an address to the Senate upon the bill, saying he believed in giving women the same rights as men had. The last Republican platform declared in favor of woman suffrage, and those Republicans who opposed the platform said they believed the women of the State should have their say about it; the Democratic platform said the same as the dissenters from the Republican. Several humorous amendments were made to the bill. Senator Kelley favored the bill because there were a great many women in the State who wanted to vote. He hoped the Senate would not be so ungallant as to vote the bill down. Senator Sluss moved the recommendation be made that the bill be rejected. Carried.

The Republican State convention of 1884 ignored the woman suffrage question. The Anti-monopoly (Greenback) party State convention, of August 1884, placed in its platform the following:

That we believe the advancing civilization of the past quarter of the nineteenth century demands that woman should have equal pay for equal work, and equal laws with man to secure her equal rights, and that she is justly entitled to the ballot.

Miss Fanny Randolph of Emporia, was nominated by acclamation for State superintendent of public instruction, by this convention. The Prohibition State convention, in session in Lawrence, September 2, 1884, placed the following plank in its platform:

We believe that women have the same right to vote as men, and in the language of the Republican State platform of two years ago, we request the next legislature to submit such an amendment to the constitution of the State as will secure to woman the right of suffrage.

This year we sent from Lincoln a petition with 175 names asking for a resolution recommending to congress the adoption of the sixteenth

Digitized by Google

amendment. The results of the election of 1884, showed quite a gain for women in county offices. There are now eleven superintendents of public instruction, several registers of deeds, and county clerks. The number of lawyers,* physicians, notaries public, principals of schools, members of school-boards in cities and school districts, is rapidly increasing, as is also the number of women who vote in school-district elections. Miss Jessie Patterson, who ran as an independent candidate for register of deeds in Davis county, beat the regular Republican nominee 286 votes, and the Democratic candidate 299 votes.

The work of organizing suffrage societies has also progressed, though not as rapidly as it should, for want of speakers and means to carry it on. Through the efforts of Mrs. Laura M. Johns of Salina, vice-president of the State society, several new and flourishing clubs have been formed this summer in Saline county, so that it is probably now the banner county in Kansas. The Lincoln society is preparing to hold a fair in September, for the benefit of the State association, which will hold its next annual convention in October. Suffrage columns in newspapers are multiplying and much stress is placed upon this branch of work. On July 18, a convention was held to organize the Prohibition party in Lincoln county. A cordial invitation was extended to women to attend. Eight were present, and many more would have been had they known of it. I was chosen secretary of the convention, and Mesdames Ellsworth and Goff were appointed upon the platform committee, and several of the central committee are women. The position of the new party upon the question may be inferred from the following clauses in its platform:

Resolved, By the Prohibition party of Lincoln county, Kansas, in convention assembled, that the three vital issues before the people to-day are prohibition, anti-monopoly, and woman suffrage.

Resolved, That we believe in the political equality of the sexes, and we call on the legislature to submit such an amendment to the people for adoption or rejection, to the constitution of the State as will secure to women equal political rights.

Later the convention nominated me for register of deeds, and Dr. Sallie A. Goff for coroner. I immediately engaged Miss Jennie Newby of Tonganoxie, member of the executive committee and State organizer of the Prohibition party of Kansas, to make a canvass of the county with me in the interest of the party and the county ticket. We held ten meetings and at all points visited made converts to both prohibition and woman suffrage, though nothing was said about the latter. There were two men on the ticket; one of them received more votes than Dr. Goff and I did, and the other fewer. Emma Faris ran independently for register of deeds in Ellsworth county and received a handsome vote. It is no longer a matter of much comment for a woman to run for an office in Kansas.

Mrs. Gougar came again to Kansas in June to attend the third annual meeting of the Radical Reform Christian Association, and spent a month lecturing on woman suffrage and temperance.

* Miss Flora M. Wagstaff of Paoli was among the first to practice law in Kansas. In 1881, Ida M. Tillotson of Mill Brook, and in 1884, Maria E. DeGeer were admitted.

Digitized by Google

January 15, 16, 1885, the annual meeting of the State society was held at Topeka. Large and enthusiastic audiences greeted Mrs. Gougar on this, her third visit to Kansas. She remained at the capital for several days, and largely through her efforts with members of the legislature special committees were voted for in both Houses to consider the interests of women. The measure was carried in the House by a vote of 75 to 45.* In the Senate it was a tie, 19 to 19. The new committee † through its chairman, George Morgan of Clay, reported in favor of a bill for municipal suffrage. It was so low on the calendar that there was no hope of its being reached, but a motion was made to take it out of its regular course, which was lost by 65 to 52.

The second annual meeting of the State society was held at Salina, October 28, 29, 1885. Mrs. Laura M. Johns gave the address of welcome, to which Mrs Anna C. Wait, the president, responded. "Mother Bickerdyke," ‡ who followed Sherman's army in its march to the sea, was present and cheered all with her stirring words of the work of women in the war.§ Her introduction was followed with applause and the earnest attention to her remarks showed in what high esteem she is held. She said that half the work of the war was done by women, but she made no complaint, indeed no mention, of the fact that these women had never been pensioned.

As it may add force to some facts already stated to have them repeated by one in authority, we give the following letter from the secretary of the Kansas Historical Society:

---

* The names of representatives voting for the committee stand as follows: *Yeas*—Barnes, Beattie, Bollinger, Bond, Bonebrake, Brewster, Buck, Butterfield, Caldwell, Campbell, Carter, Clogston, J. B. Cook of Chetopa, H. C. Cook of Oswego, Collins, Cox, Currier, Davenport, Dickson, Edwards, Faulkner, Gillespie, Glasgow, Gray, Grier, Hargrave, Hatfield, Hogue, Hollenshead, Holman, Hopkins, Hostetler, Johnson of Ness City, Johnson of Marshall, Johnson of Topeka, Johnson (Speaker of the House), Kelley of Cawker City, King, Kreger, Lawrence, Lewis, Loofburrow, Lower, McBride, McNall, McNeal, Matlock, Maurer, Miller, Moore, Morgan of Clay, Morgan of Osborne, Mosher, Osborn, Patton, Pratt, Reeves, Rhodes, Roach, Roberts, Slavens, Spiers, Simpson, Smith of McPherson, Smith of Neosho, Stewart, Stine, Sweezy, Talbot, Vance, Veach, Wallace, Wentworth, Wiggins, Willhelm—75. The names of senators were: *Yeas*—Bowden, Congdon, Donnell, Edmunds, Granger, Hicks, Humphrey, Jennings, M. B. Kelley, Kellogg, Kimball, Kohler, Pickler, Ritter, Rush, Shean, Sheldon, White, Young—19.

† The Committee on the Political Rights of Women, granted by the House, were: George Morgan of Clay, George Seitz of Ellsworth, David Kelso of Labette, F. W. Rash of Butler, W. C. Edwards of Pawnee, F. J. Kelley of Mitchell, W. H. Deckard of Doniphan.

‡ The speakers were: Rev. Amanda May (formerly of Indiana), Mrs. Martha L. Berry, Mrs. Ada Sill, Mrs. Colby, Dr. Addie Kester, Mrs. M. D. Vale, Rev. C. H. Rogers, Mrs. De Geer, Miss Jennie Newby. Officers: *President*, Mrs. Anna C. Wait of Lincoln; *Vice-President*, Mrs. Laura M. Johns of Salina; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Martia L. Berry of Cawker City; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. B. H. Ellsworth of Lincoln; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. Alice G. Bond of Salina.

§ When Miss Anthony and I went through Kansas in 1867 we held an afternoon and evening meeting in Salina. Our accommodations at the hotel were wretched beyond description. Mother Bickerdyke was just preparing to open her hotel but was still in great confusion. Hearing of our dismal quarters she came and took us to her home, where her exquisitely cooked food and clean beds redeemed in a measure our dolorous impressions of Salina. Our meetings were held in an unfinished church without a floor, the audience sitting on the beams, our opponents (two young lawyers) and ourselves on a few planks laid across, where a small stand was placed and one tallow candle to lighten the discussion that continued until a late hour. Being delayed the next day at the depot a long time waiting for the train we held another prolonged discussion with these same sprigs of the legal profession. We had intended to go on to Ellsworth, but hearing of trouble there with the Indians we turned our faces eastward. Mother Bickerdyke and her thrilling stories of the war are the pleasant memories that still linger with us of Salina.—[E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

KANSAS HISTORICAL SOCIETY Topeka, Nov. 26, 1885

MISS SUSAN B. ANTHONY, Rochester, N. Y.:

My Dear Friend:—In answer to your request for information upon certain points bearing upon the subject of woman suffrage in Kansas, I give the following:

The women avail themselves quite generally of their privilege of voting at the annual and special school district meetings, at which district officers are elected, and all questions of taxes and expenditures are voted on and settled. Women are, in many instances, elected members of the board of school directors, and thus are charged with the duty of employing teachers, with the supervision of the schools, and with the general management of the affairs of the district. Women vote on the question of the issue of school district bonds, and thus they take part in deciding whether new school houses shall be built and the property of the districts be pledged for the future payment of the cost of the same.

In the chartered cities women do not generally vote for school officers although, under the constitution, it is believed they have the right to do so, and in one or more instances I am informed they have done so, without the right being contested. In cities, school officers are elected at general elections for other city officers, for which women are not permitted to vote, and as they cannot vote for all they generally do not choose to vote for any. Women do not vote for either city, county, or State superindents, and it is not considered that under our constitution they have the right to do so.

In 1884, there were 4,915 women teaching in the State, and 1,936 men. The average monthly wages of women was $32.85, and of men, $40.70. There are at present twelve women holding the office of county superintendent of public schools in the State. In 72 counties the office is filled by men. Thus, of the 84 organized counties of the State, one-seventh of the school superintendents are women, who generally prove to be competent and efficient, and the number elected is increasing.

In one county, Harper, a woman holds the office of county clerk. A young woman was recently elected to the office of register of deeds, in Davis county. It is conceded that these two offices can very appropriately be filled by women; and now that the movement has begun, no doubt the number of those elected will increase at recurring elections. Already, in numerous instances, women are employed as deputies and assistants in these and other public offices.

The participation of women in school elections and their election to membership of school district boards, are resulting in a steady growth of sentiment in favor of woman suffrage, generally. It is seen that in the decision of questions involving the proper maintenance of schools, and the supplying of school apparatus, women usually vote for liberal and judicious expenditures, and make faithful school officers. Their failures are not those of omission, as is so frequently the case with men holding these offices. If they err in judgment, it is from a lack of that business information and experience which women as non-voters have had little opportunity to acquire, but which, under our Kansas system is now rapidly being supplied.

Among the influences tending to increase the suffrage sentiment in Kansas, may be mentioned those growing out of the active part women are taking in the discussion of political, economical, moral and social questions, through their participation in the proceedings of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the State Temperance Union, the Woman's Social Science Association, the Kansas Academy of Science, the Grange, the State and local Teachers' Associations, and many other organizations in which women have come to perform so prominent a part. In these organizations, and in the part they take in discussions, they show their capacity to grapple with the political, social, and scientific problems of the day, in such a manner as to demonstrate their ability to perform the highest duties of citizenship. Still the chief influence which is bringing about a growth of opinion in favor of woman suffrage in Kansas, comes from what has now become the actual, and I may say, the popular and salutary practice of woman suffrage at school district meetings. It is seen that the reasons which make it right and expedient for women to vote on questions pertaining to the

education of their children, bear with little, if any, less force upon the propriety of their voting upon all questions affecting the public welfare.

I think I may truly say to you that the tendencies in Kansas are to the steady growth of sentiment in favor of woman suffrage. This is so apparent that few of those even who do not believe in its propriety or expediency now doubt that it will eventually be adopted, and the political consequences fully brought to the test of experience.

Yours sincerely, F. G. ADAMS.

The greatest obstacle to our speedy success in this State, as elsewhere, is the ignorance and indifference of the women themselves. But the earnestness and enthusiasm of the few, in their efforts from year to year, cannot be wholly lost—the fires kindled by that memorable campaign of 1867 are not dead, only slumbering, to burst forth with renewed brilliancy in the dawn of the day that brings liberty, justice, and equality for woman.

CHAPTER LI.

COLORADO.

Great American Desert—Organized as a Territory, February 28, 1860—Gov. McCook's Message Recommending Woman Suffrage, 1870—Adverse Legislation—Hon. Amos Steck—Admitted to the Union, 1876—Constitutional Convention—Efforts to Strike Out the Word "Male"—Convention to Discuss Woman Suffrage—School Suffrage Accorded—State Association Formed, Alida C. Avery, President—Proposition for Full Suffrage Submitted to the Popular Vote—A Vigorous Campaign—Mrs. Campbell and Mrs. Patterson of Denver—Opposition by the Clergy—Their Arguments Ably Answered—D. M. Richards—The Amendment Lost—*The Rocky Mountain News.*

THAT our English readers may appreciate the Herculean labors that the advocates of suffrage undertake in this country in canvassing a State, they must consider the vast territory to be traveled over, in stages and open wagons where railroads are scarce. Colorado, for example, covers an area of 104,500 square miles. It is divided by the Rocky Mountains running north and south, with two hundred lofty peaks rising thirteen thousand feet above the level of the sea, and some still higher. To reach the voters in the little mining towns a hundred miles apart, over mountains such as these, involves hardships that only those who have made the journeys can understand. But there is some compensation in the variety, beauty and grandeur of the scenery, with its richly wooded valleys, vast parks and snow-capped mountains. It is the region for those awake to the sublime in nature to reverently worship some of her grandest works that no poet can describe nor artist paint. Here, too, the eternal struggle for liberty goes on, for the human soul can never be attuned to harmony with its surroundings, especially the grand and glorious, until the birthright of justice and equality is secured to all.

For a history of the early efforts made in the Centennial State to secure equal rights for women, we are indebted to Mrs. Mary G. Campbell and Mrs. Katharine G. Patterson, two sisters who have been actively interested in the suffrage movement in Colorado, as follows:

In 1848, while those immortal women whose names will be found on many another page of the volume in which this chapter is included, were asking in the convention at Seneca Falls, N. Y., that their equal membership in the human family might be admitted by their husbands, fathers and sons, Colorado, unnamed and unthought of, was still asleep with her head above the clouds. Only two mountain-tops in all the world were nearer heaven than hers, and they, in far Thibet, had seen the very beginnings of the race which, after six thousand years, had not yet penetrated Colorado. Islanded in a cruel brown ocean of sand, she hid her treasures of gold and silver in her virgin bosom and dreamed, unstirred by any echoes of civilization. When she woke at last it was to the sound of an anvil chorus—to the ring of the mallet and drill, and the hoarse voices of men greedy only for gold.

In 1858, when the Ninth National Convention of women to demand their legal rights was in session in New York, there were only three white women in the now rich and beautiful city of Denver. Still another ten years of wild border life, of fierce vicissitudes, of unwritten tragedies enacted in forest and mine, and Colorado was organized into a territory with a population of 5,000 women and 25,000 men.

The first effort for suffrage was made in 1870, during the fifth session of the legislative assembly, soon after General Edward McCook was sent out by President Grant to fill the gubernatorial chair. In his message to the legislature, he promptly recommended to the attention of its members the question of suffrage for woman:

> Before dismissing the subject of franchise, I desire to call your attention to one question connected with it, which you may deem of sufficient importance to demand some consideration at your hands before the close of the session. Our higher civilization has recognized woman's equality with man in all respects save one—suffrage. It has been said that no great reform was ever made without passing through three stages—ridicule, argument, and adoption. It rests with you to say whether Colorado will accept this reform in its first stage, as our sister territory of Wyoming has done, or in the last; whether she will be a leader or a follower; for the logic of a progressive civilization leads to the inevitable result of a universal suffrage.

This was the first gun of the campaign, and summoned to the field various contending forces, armed with ridicule, argument, or an optimistic diplomacy, urging an immediate surrender of the ground claimed. Bills favoring the enfranchisement of women were discussed both in the Territorial Council Chamber and in the lower House of the legislature. The subject was taken up by the press and the people, and not escaping its meed of ridicule, was seriously dealt with by both friend and enemy. Perhaps the western champions of woman's recognition as an intelligent part of the body politic were brought to understand the full meaning of her disabilities by their own experiences as territorial minors. Certain it is that the high spirit of the citizens of Colorado chafed intolerably under the temporary limitations of accustomed rights of sovereign manhood. The federal government, in the capacity of regent, sent to these territorial wards their officers and governors and fixed the rate of their taxation without full representation. These wards were indeed empowered, as were the people of their sister territories, to elect a delegate to the

national congress, whose opinions upon territorial matters were allowed expression in that body, but who could no more enforce there his convictions upon important measures, by a vote, than could the most intelligent woman of this territory upon the question of his election to represent her interests.

In the Colorado papers of those days of territorial tutelage, there appeared repeatedly most impatient protests against these humiliating conditions of citizenship. With the attainment of statehood in 1876 there came to the men of Colorado a restoration of their full rights as citizens of the Republic. According to the proscriptive usage, the humiliating conditions of citizenship without the ballot, remained to the women of the Centennial State; and those of their reënfranchised brothers who had felt most keenly their own unaccustomed restrictions, were without doubt the foremost advocates of the movement to secure the full recognition of women's rights.

The majority of the territorial legislative assembly of 1870 was unexpectedly Democratic, and almost as unexpected was the favor promptly shown by the Democratic members to the passage of the bill proposing woman suffrage. The measure was indeed characterized by the opposing Republicans, as "the great Democratic reform," and for weeks seemed destined to triumph through Democratic votes, in spite of the frivolous and serious opposition of the Republican minority, and the few Democratic members who deserted what then seemed the party policy upon this question. The pleas urged in advocacy of the new movement, as well as the protests urged against it, were substantially the same as were used in the East at that stage of the question. Accompanying them were the extravagancies of hope and fear incident to the early consideration of every suggested change in a long-accepted social order. An impossible Utopia was promised on the one hand no less confidently than was predicted upon the other a dire iconoclasm of the sacred shrine of long-adored ideals, as a consequence of simply granting to intelligent women a privilege justly their due. Both the derision and the adverse reasoning of the alarmists were well met by fearless friends, in Council and House. Bills looking to the removal of woman's disabilities were referred in each to a select committee for consideration, on January 19. The majority report to the House through the chairman of its special committee, M. DeFrance, was an able advocacy of the measure under consideration, while the adverse recommendation of the Council committee was accompanied by an excellent report by Hon. Amos Steck, setting forth clearly the reasons of the minority for their favorable views. After hearing the reports, both Houses went into committee of the whole for a free discussion upon the question.

"The criterion of civilization, physical force," "Strength as the measure of right,"—as recent writers have defined the divine right of might—seemed the basis of reasoning with those who claimed that woman should not be given the ballot because she might not carry the sword. Dark pictures were drawn of possible women as electors plunging their country into wars, from whose consequences they would themselves suffer noth-

ing. By the more hopeful it was urged that the mighty heart, the moral force of humanity, as represented in womanhood, and united with clear womanly intelligence, would prove a greater power in all State interests than sword or bayonet.

The strongest speaker in the legislature upon the subject of suffrage—President Hinsdale of the Council—was, unfortunately, a bitter enemy of the proposed reform. Yet some of his most forcible utterances made in committee of the whole, were excellent arguments in favor of, rather than against the measure. Excellent arguments in favor of the bill in question were made by leading members of the House—Messrs. Lea, Shepard and DeFrance. By invitation of the legislature, that body was addressed by a prominent member of the Denver bar, Mr. Willard Teller, the brother of one of our U. S. senators. The hall was filled by an interested audience to hear Mr. Teller's address, which was a strong presentation of the principles upon which rest the claims of American citizens to universal suffrage.

Outside the assembly halls, Governor McCook and his beautiful, accomplished, and gracefully aggressive wife, strongly favored the affirmative of the question at issue, while Willard Teller, D. M. Richards and other distinguished men and women of the territory were active friends during the contest. In the press, the measure had a most influential support in the *Daily Colorado Tribune*, a well-conducted Denver journal, edited by Mr. R. W. Woodbury. Space in its columns was given to well-written articles by contributors interested in the success of the cause, and many able editorials appeared, embodying strong arguments in favor of the reform, or answering the opposing bitterness and frivolity of its contemporary the *Rocky Mountain News*. The interest in the proposed innovation was indeed quite general throughout the territory, but wherever the subject was discussed, in the legislative halls, in private conversation, editorial column, or correspondence of the press, the grounds argumentatively traversed were the same highways and byways of reason and absurdity which have been so often since gone over.

There was perhaps one lion in the way of establishing universal suffrage in the West, which the eastern advocates did not fear. It was said that our intelligent women could not be allowed to vote, whatever the principles upon which the right might be claimed, because in that case, the poor, degraded Chinese women who might reach our shores, would also be admitted to the voting list, and what then would become of our proud, Caucasian civilization? Whether it was the thought of the poor Mongolian slave at the polls, or some other equally terrifying vision of a yearly visit of American women to the centre of some voting precinct, the majority of the Colorado legislative assembly of 1870, in spite of all the free discussion of the campaign of that year, decided adversely. In the latter days of the session, the bill having taken the form of a proposition to submit the question at issue to the already qualified voters of the territory, was lost in the council chamber by a majority of one, and in the House by a two-thirds majority, leaving to the defeated friends of the reform as their only reward, a consciousness of strength gained in the contest.

A few years more made Denver a city beautiful for habitation, made Colorado a garden, filled that goodly land with capable men, and intelligent, spirited women. Statehood had been talked of, but lost, and then men began to say: "The one hundredth birthday of our American independence is so near, let us make this a centennial State; let the entrance into the Union be announced by the same bells that shall ring in our national anniversary." And so it was decreed. Mindful of 1776—mindful too, of the second declaration made by the women at the first equal rights convention in 1848, the friends of equality in Colorado determined to gird themselves for a supreme effort in anticipation of the constitution that was to be framed for the new State to be.

A notice was published asking all persons favorable to suffrage for women, to convene in Denver, January 10, to take measures to secure the recognition of woman's equality under the pending constitution. In pursuance to this call, a large and eager audience filled Unity Church long before the hour appointed for the meeting. A number of the orthodox clergy were present. The Rev. Mrs. Wilkes of Colorado Springs, opened the exercises with prayer. Mrs. Margaret W. Campbell of Massachusetts was then introduced, and said: "This convention was called to present woman's claims to the ballot, from her own stand-point, and to take such measures to secure the recognition of her equality in the constitution of Colorado, as the friends gathered from different parts of the territory may think proper. We do not ask that women shall take the places of men, or usurp authority over them; we only ask that the principles upon which our government is founded shall be applied to women.

Rev. Mrs. Wilkes made an especial point of the fact that in Colorado Springs women owned one-third of the taxable property, and yet were obliged (at the recent spring election) to see the bonds for furnishing a supply of pure water, voted down because women had no voice in the matter. This had been a serious mistake, as the physicians of the place had pronounced the present supply impure and unwholesome. She referred to the fears of many that the constitution, freighted with woman suffrage, might sink, when it would else be buoyant, and begged her hearers not to fear such a burden would endanger it. The convention continued through two days with enthusiastic speeches from Mr. D. M. Richards and Rev. Mr. Wright, who preferred to be introduced as the nephew of Dr. Harriot K. Hunt of Boston. Letters were read from Lucy Stone and Judge Kingman, and an extract from the message of Governor Thayer of Wyoming, in which he declared the results of woman suffrage in that territory to have been beneficial and its influence favorable to the best interests of the community. A territorial society was formed with an efficient board of officers;* resolutions, duly discussed, were adopted,

* *President*, Alida C. Avery, M. D., Denver. *Vice-Presidents*, Rev. Mr. Harford, Denver; Mr. J. E. Washburn, Big Thompson; Mrs. H. M. Lee, Longmont; Mrs. M. M. Sheetz, Cañon City; Mrs. L. S. Ruhn, Del Norte; Mr. N. C. Meeker, Greeley; Hon. Willard Teller, Central; Mr. D. M. Richards, Denver; Mr. J. B. Harrington, Littleton; Mr. A. E. Lee, Boulder; Rev. Wm. Shephard, Cañon City. *Recording Secretary*, Miss Eunice D. Sewall, Denver. *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. A. L. Washburn, Big Thompson. *Treasurer*, Mrs. I. T. Hanna, Denver. *Executive Committee*, Mrs. M. F. Shields, Colorado Springs; Mr. A. L. Ellis, Boulder; Mrs. M. E. Hale, Denver; Mr. W. A. Wilkes, Colorado Springs; Mr. J. R. Hanna, Denver; Mrs. S. C. Wilber, Greeley; Rev. Dr. Crary, Pueblo.

Digitized by Google

and the meeting closed with a carefully-prepared address by Dr. Avery, the newly-elected president of the territorial association.

The committee* appointed to wait upon the constitutional convention were received courteously by that body, and listened to with respectful attention. One would have thought the gentlemen to whom the arguments and appeals of such women were addressed would have found it in their hearts to make some reply, even while disclaiming the official character of their act; but they preserved a decorous and non-committal, if not incurious silence, and the ladies withdrew. The press said, the morning after their visit: "The gentlemen were all interested and amused by the errand of the ladies." The morning following, the constitutional convention was memorialized by the Suffrage Association of Missouri, and was also presented with a petition signed by a thousand citizens of Colorado, asking that in the new constitution no distinction be made on account of sex. This was only the beginning. Petitions came in afterwards, numerously signed, and were intended to have the force of a sort of ante-election vote.

Denver presented an interesting social aspect at this time. It was as if the precursive tremor of a moral earthquake had been felt, and people, only half awake, did not know whether to seek safety in the house, or outside of it. Women especially were perplexed and inquiring, and it was observed that those in favor of asking a recognition of their rights in the new State, were the intelligent and leading ladies of the city. The wives of ministers, of congressmen, of judges, the prominent members of Shakespeare clubs, reading circles, the directors of charitable institutions,—these were the ones who first ranged themselves on the side of equal rights, clearly proving that the man was right who pointed out the danger of allowing women to learn the alphabet.

When February 15 came, it was a momentous day for Colorado. The report of the Committee on Suffrage and Elections was to come up for final action. As a matter of fact there were two reports; that of the minority was signed by two members of the committee, Judge Bromwell, whose breadth and scholarship were apparent in his able report, and a Mexican named Agapita Vigil, a legislator from Southern Colorado where Spanish is the dominant tongue. Mr. Vigil spoke no English, and was one of those representatives for whose sake an interpreter was maintained during the session of the convention.

Ladies were present in large numbers. Some of the gentlemen celebrated the occasion by an unusual spruceness of attire, and others by being sober enough to attend to business. The report with three-fifths of the signatures, after setting forth that the subject had had careful con-

* Of the membership of this committee a grateful word is to be said: Mrs. Campbell is a woman of agreeable and stately presence, and adds to thorough information on all points connected with the claims made in this campaign, an unusual facility and persuasiveness of language. Mrs. Shields is one of the most lovable women to be seen in the suffrage panorama; a tower of strength in her own family, where she is at once the comrade and commander of her children—the help-meet and friend of her husband. She inspires immediate confidence whenever she confronts an audience. Mrs. Washburn is also an attractive and large-hearted woman—a "Granger," and thus experienced in united, organized action of men and women for furthering the interests of both. Mrs. Hanna, a tall, graceful blonde, more reserved in speech but entirely intelligent in faith and in labor, represented to many men of the convention the very qualities they liked in their own wives.

Digitized by Google

sideration, went on to state the qualifications of voters, namely, that all should be male citizens, with one exception, and that was, that women might vote for school district officers.

Mr. A. K. Yount of Boulder, spoke in favor of the motion to strike out the word "male" in section 1: "That every male person over the age of 21 years, possessing the necessary qualifications, shall be entitled to vote," etc. He called attention to the large number of petitions which had been sent in, asking for this, and to the fact that not a single remonstrance had been received. He believed the essential principles of human freedom were involved in this demand, and he insisted that justice required that women should help to make the laws by which they are governed. The amendment was lost by a vote of 24 to 8.

Mr. Storm offered an amendment that women be permitted to vote for, and hold the office of, county superintendent of schools. This also was lost. The only other section of the report which had any present interest to women, was the one reading:

SECTION 2. The General Assembly may at any time extend by law the right of suffrage to persons not herein enumerated, but no such law shall take effect or be in force until the same shall have been submitted to a vote of the people, at a general election, and approved by a majority of all the votes cast for and against such law.

After much discussion it was voted that the first General Assembly should provide a law whereby the subject should be submitted to a vote of the electors.

After this the curtain fell, the lights were put out, and all the atmosphere and *mise en scène* of the drama vanished. It was well known, however, that another season would come, the actors would reäppear, and an "opus" would be given; whether it should turn out a tragedy, or a Miriam's song of deliverance, no one was able to predict. Meantime, the women of Colorado—to change the figure—bivouacked on the battlefield, and sent for reinforcements against the fall campaign. They held themselves well together, and used their best endeavors to educate public sentiment.

A column in the Denver *Rocky Mountain News*, a pioneer paper then edited by W. N. Byers, was offered the woman suffrage association, through which to urge our claims. The column was put into the hands of Mrs. Campbell, the wife of E. L. Campbell, of the law firm of Patterson & Campbell of Denver, for editorship. This lady, from whose editorials quotations will be given, was too timid (she herself begs us to say cowardly) to use her name in print, and so translated it into its German equivalent of *Schlachtfeld*, thus nullifying whatever of weight her own name would have carried in the way of personal and social endorsement of an unpopular cause. Her sister, Mrs. T. M. Patterson, an early and earnest member of the Colorado Suffrage Association, "bore testimony" as courageously and constantly as her environment permitted.

Mrs. Gov. McCook, as previously stated, had been the first woman in Colorado to set the example of a spirited claim to simple political justice for her sex, but she, alas! at the date now reached in our sketch, was dead —in her beautiful youth, in the first flower of her sweet, bright womanhood. Her loss to the cause can best be measured by those who know

what an immense uplifting power is present when an intelligent man in an influential position joins his personal and political force to his wife's personal and social force in the endeavor to accomplish an object dear to both.

It is a pity not to register here, however inadequately, some outline of many figures that rise to form a part of the picture of Colorado in 1876–7. When liberty shall have been achieved, and all citizens shall be comfortably enjoying its direct and indirect blessings, this book should be found to have preserved in the amber of its pages the names of those who bravely wrought for freedom in that earlier time. Would that one might indeed summon them all by a roll-call! But they will not answer—they say only: "Let our work stand for us, be its out-come small or great."

To Dr. Alida C. Avery, however, whatever the outcome, a weighty obligation is due from all past, present and future laborers in this cause in Colorado. She it was who set at work and kept at work the interplay of ideas and efforts which accomplished what was done. Through her personal acquaintance with the immortals at the East, Lucy Stone, Susan B. Anthony, Henry B. Blackwell, she drew them to Colorado during the campaign about to be described, and with them came others. Mrs. M. W. Campbell and her husband reäppeared to do faithful service, and then came also Miss Lelia Patridge of Philadelphia, a young, graceful, and effective speaker,—so the local papers constantly describe her, and then came, in the person of Miss Matilda Hindman of Pittsburg Pa., one of the ablest women of the whole campaign. Gentle, persuasive, womanly, she was at the same time armed at all points with fact, argument, and illustration, and her zeal was only equaled by her power of sustained labor.

Many of these same qualities belong to Mrs. M. F. Shields, of Colorado Springs, one of the committee on constitutional work in the campaign of 1876, and an ardent, unceasing, unselfish laborer in the church, in suffrage and temperance, for more than ten years. She did not lecture, but "talked"; talked to five hundred men at a time as if they were her own sons, and only needed to be shown they were conniving at injustice, in order to turn about and do the right thing. This same element of "motherliness" it was, which gained her the respectful attention of an audience of the roughest and most ignorant Cornish miners up in Caribou, who would listen to no other woman speaking upon the subject. When the members of the famous constitutional committee were considering the suffrage petition, prior to making their report, Judge Stone of Pueblo, tried to persuade the Spanish-speaking member that to grant the franchise to women would be to be false to his party, as those women were all Democrats. But Senor Vigil replied that he had been talking through his interpreter to the "nice old lady, who smiled so much" (meaning Mrs. Shields), and he knew what they asked was all right, and he should vote for it.

Of the men who were willing to obey Paul's entreaty to "help those women," must be named in the front rank David M. Richards of Denver, a pioneer of '59, and as brave and generous and true a heart as ever beat

in time to the pulse of progress, Rev. B. F. Crary, a true apostolic helper, Mr. Henry C. Dillon, a young western Raleigh for knightly chivalry, Hon. J. B. Belford, member of congress then and now, Judge H. P. H. Bromwell, who needs no commendation from the historian, as his eloquent minority report speaks adequately for him; these, and very many more, both men and women, have, as the French say, "deserved well of the State and of their generation."

And it was once more to the aid of these men and women that the East sent reinforcements as soon as the winter of 1877 was well ushered in. An annual convention was announced for January 15, in Denver. When the bitter cold evening came it seemed doubtful if any great number of persons would be present, but the large Lawrence street Methodist Church was, on the contrary, packed to its utmost capacity. Rev. Mr. Eads, pastor of the church, opened the meeting with prayer, and Dr. Avery, as president of the association, gave a brief *résumé* of the work during its one year of existence. Colonel Henry Logan of Boulder (formerly of Illinois), made a manly and telling speech in favor of a measure which he called one of axiomatic justice. Mrs. Wright of New York, after a piquant address, announced the meeting of the convention for the next day. On the following morning a business session was held, and officers elected for the year.* In the afternoon speeches were made by Dr. Crary, Mrs. Shields, and Mr. David Boyd of Greeley, and in the evening by Mr. Henry C. Dillon and Rev. J. R. Eads, the closing and crowning speech of the convention being given by Miss Laura Hanna of Denver, a *petite*, pretty young girl, whose remarks made a *bonne bouche* with which to close the feast. Interest in the subject rose to fever heat before October. Pulpit, press and fireside were occupied with its discussion. The most effective, and at the same time, exasperating opposition, came from the pulpit, but there was also vigorous help from the same quarter. The Catholic Bishop preached a series of sermons and lectures, in which he fulminated all the thunders of apostolic and papal revelation against women who wanted to vote:

Though strong-minded women who are not satisfied with the disposition of Providence and who wish to go beyond the condition of their sex, profess no doubt to be Christians, do they consult the Bible?—do they follow the Bible? I fear not. Had God intended to create a companion for man, capable of following the same pursuits, able to undertake the same labors, he would have created another man; but he created a woman, and she fell. * * * The class of women wanting suffrage are battalions of old maids disappointed in love—women separated from their husbands or divorced by men from their sacred obligations—women who, though married, wish to hold the reins of the family government, for there never was a woman happy in her home who wished for female suffrage. * * * Who will take charge of those young children (if they consent to have any) while mothers as surgeons are operating indiscriminately upon the victims of a terrible railway disaster? * * * No kind hus-

---

* *President*, Dr. Alida C. Avery of Denver; *Vice-Presidents*, D. Howe, Mrs. M. B. Hart, J. E. Washburn, Mrs. Emma Moody, Willard Teller, J. B. Harrington, A. E. Lee, and N. C. Meeker; *Recording Secretary*, Birks Carnforth of Denver; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. T. M. Patterson of Denver; *Treasurer*, Mrs. H. C. Lawson of Denver; *Executive Committee*, D. M. Richards, Mrs. M. F. Shields, Mrs. M. E. Hale, H. McAllister, Mrs. Birks Carnforth, J. A. Dresser, A. J. Wilber, B. F. Crary, Miss Annie Figg, H. Logan, J. R. Eads, F. M. Ellis, C. Roby, Judge Jones, General Cameron, B. H. Eaton, Agapita Vigil, W. B. Felton, S. C. Charles and J. B. Campbell.

band will refuse to nurse the baby on Sunday (when every kind of business is stopped) in order to let his wife attend church; but even then, as it is not his natural duty, he will soon be tired of it and perhaps get impatient waiting for the mother, chiefly when the baby is crying.

These, with the omnipresent quotations from St. Paul to the effect that women shall keep silence in the church, etc., formed the argument of the Bishop in two or three lengthy sermons. Indignant men, disgusted with the caliber of the opposition and yet obliged to notice it on account of the position of the divine, made ample rejoinders. Rev. Dr. Crary of Golden, in an exhaustive review of the Bishop's discourse, deprecated the making permanent and of universal application the commands which with Paul were evidently temporary and local, and said half the churches in christendom would be closed if these were literally obeyed:

"Women should not usurp authority, therefore men should usurp all authority." This is the sort of logic we have always heard from men who are trotting along in the wake of progress and howling because the centuries do not stop rolling onward. In barbarous regions Paul is paraded against educating girls at all. In half-civilized nations Paul is doing service against educating girls except in the rudiments. Among people who are just beginning to see the hill-tops of a higher, nobler world, Paul is still on duty crowding off women from high-schools and colleges. Proud universities to-day have Paul standing guard over medical meanness and pushing down aspiring female souls from the founts of knowledge. Within our memory Paul has been the standing demonstration in favor of slavery, intemperance and the oppression of women.

Another sermon in which the Bishop lays solemn stress on the one sacred, inevitable duty of women to become wives and mothers, was answered by Mr. David Boyd of Greeley, who, among other things, asks the Bishop:

How, in view of the injunction to increase and multiply, he can justify the large celibate class created by positive command of the Catholic church, not only by the ordination of priests, but by the constant urging of the church that women should become the barren brides of Christ by taking on them the vows of nuns.

The Bishop published his lectures in pamphlet form, that their influence might be far-reaching, and curiously enough, the very same lectures were printed and scattered by the friends of suffrage as the best sort of document for the campaign now fairly inaugurated. D. M. Richards, the able chairman of the executive committee, and Dr. Avery, president of the association, showed themselves capable of both conceiving and executing a plan of operations which had the merit of at least deserving victory.

There was no lack of pens to defend women's claim to equal chances in the struggle for existence. In Denver, the *Rocky Mountain News* and the *Times* planted themselves fairly and squarely in an affirmative attitude, and gave generous aid to the effort. The *Tribune's* columns were in a state of chronic congestion from a plethora of protests, both feminine and masculine. One young lawyer said: "If suffrage is to come, let it come by man's call, and not by woman's clamor"; and, "When all the women of the land can show the ability to rear a family, and at the same time become eminent in some profession or art, then men will gladly welcome them." Whereupon the women naturally rushed into print to protest

against the qualifications required of them, compared with those required of men.

It is safe to say, that from the middle of January, 1877, until the following October, the most prominent theme of public discussion was this question of suffrage for women. Miners discussed it around their campfires, and "freighters" on their long slow journeys over the mountain trails argued *pro* and *con*, whether they should "let" women have the ballot. Women themselves argued and studied and worked earnestly. One lawyer's wife, who declared that no refined woman would contend for such a right, and that no woman with self-respect would be found electioneering, herself urged every man of her acquaintance to vote against the measure, and even triumphantly reported that she had spoken to seventy-five men who were strangers to her, and secured their promise to vote against the pending amendment. This, however, must not be mistaken for electioneering.

On Wednesday, August 15, an equal rights mass-meeting was held in Denver, for the purpose of organizing a county central committee, and for an informal discussion of plans for the campaign. Judge H. P. H. Bromwell and H. C. Dillon spoke, with earnest repetition of former pledges of devotion to the cause, and Gov. Evans said:

Equal suffrage is necessary to equal rights. It is fortunate that we have in Colorado an opportunity of bringing to bear the restraining, purifying and ennobling influence of women upon politics. It is a reform that will require all the benign influences of the country to sustain and carry out, and, as I hope for the perpetuation of our free institutions, I dare not neglect the most promising and potent means of purifying politics, and I regard the influence of women as this means.

Major Bright of Wyoming, was introduced as the man who framed and brought in the first bill for the enfranchisement of women. Judge W. B. Mills said: "It is an anomalous condition of affairs which made it necessary for a woman to ask a man whether she should vote," and referring to all the reforms and changes of the last half century, predicted that the extension of the franchise to woman would be the next in order.

The meeting was a full and fervid one, and great confidence of success was felt and expressed. A committee of seventeen was appointed * and this committee did its full duty in districting the territory and sending out speakers. Mr. Henry B. Blackwell, Lucy Stone and Miss Anthony arrived almost immediately after this, and henceforth the advocates of suffrage swarmed through the rocky highways and byways of Colorado as eagerly, if not as multitudinously, as its gold seekers. Mrs. Campbell wrote to the *Woman's Journal:*

We have now been at work two weeks. Some of our meetings are very encouraging, some not so much so. But the meetings are only one feature of the work. We stop along the way and search out all the leading men in each voting precinct, and secure the names of those who will work on election day. We do more talking out of meeting than in. We rode thirty-five miles yesterday, and arrived here after six o'clock in

* Consisting of Dr. R. G. Buckingham, chairman, Hon. John Evans, Judge G. W. Miller, Benjamin D. Spencer, A. J. Williams, Captain Richard Sopris, E. B. Sluth, John Armor, Hon. E. L. Campbell, John Walker, J. U. Marlow, Col. W. H. Bright, John G. Lilly, John S. McCool, J. W. Nesmyth, Henry O. Wagoner, and Dr. Martimore.

the evening. While Mr. Campbell was taking care of the horse, I filled out bills before taking off my hat and duster; in fifteen minutes they were being distributed, and at eight o'clock I was speaking to a good-sized audience.

On October 1, a monster meeting was held in the Lawrence street Methodist Church, and was addressed by Lucy Stone, Miss Matilda Hindman, Mrs. Campbell, and Dr. Avery. The most intense interest was manifested, and the excellent speeches heartily applauded.

The next day (Sunday) the Rev. Dr. Bliss of the Presbyterian Church, preached a sermon in his own pulpit, on "Woman Suffrage and the Model Wife and Mother," in which he alluded to "certain brawling, ranting women, bristling for their rights," and said God had intended woman to be a wife and mother, and the eternal fitness of things forbade her to be anything else. If women could vote, those who were wives now would live in endless bickerings with their husbands over politics, and those who were not wives would not marry."

These utterences brought out many replies. One was in the column edited by "Mrs. Schlachtfeld," and may perhaps be quoted as a specimen of her editorial work, such being, as we have intimated, her one service to suffrage, and that incognito:

One of the daily, dismal forecasts of the male Cassandras of our time is, that in the event of women becoming emancipated from the legal thralldom that disables them, they will acquire a sudden distaste for matrimony, the direful consequences of which will be a gradual extermination of homes, and the extinction of the human species. This is an artless and extremely suggestive lament. In the first place—accepting that prophecy as true—why will women not marry? Because, they will then be independent of men; because in a fair field for competition where ability and not sex shall determine employment and remuneration, women will have an equal chance with men for distinction and reward, for triumphs commercial and professional as well as social, and hence, needing men less, either to make them homes, or to gratify indirectly their ambitions, their affections will become atrophied, the springs of domestic life will disappear in the arid sands of an unfeminine publicity, and marriage, with all the wearying cares and burdens and anxieties that it inevitably brings to every earnest woman, will be regarded more and more as a state to be shunned. The few who enter it will be compassionated much as a minister is who undertakes a dangerous foreign mission. Men will stand mateless, and the ruins of the hymeneal altars everywhere crumble mournfully away, and be known to tradition only by their vanishing inscriptions: "To the unknown god." But it is ill jesting over that which tugs at every woman's heart-strings and which impinges upon the very life-centres of society. If women, on being made really free to choose, will not marry, then we must arraign men on the charge of having made the married state so irksome and distasteful to women that they prefer celibacy when they dare enjoy it. Observe, however, the inconsistency of another line of reasoning running parallel with this in the floating literature of the day: "Motherhood," these writers say, "is the natural vocation of women; is, indeed, an instinct so mighty, even if unconscious, that it draws women toward matrimony with a yearning as irresistible as that which pulls the great sea upon the land in blind response to the moon." If this be true, society is safe, and women will still be wives, no matter how much they may exult in political freedom, no matter how alluringly individual careers may open before them, nor how accessible the tempting prizes of human ambition may become.

Well, the day came,—the *dies irae* for one side or the other, and it proved to be for the "one." The measure was defeated. Ten thousand votes were for it, twenty thousand against it. Women remained at the polls all day,

distributing ballots, and answering objections. They had flowers on all the little tables where the tickets were heaped, on which were printed the three words, "Woman Suffrage Approved," words for many pregnant with hope for a new impetus to civilization, for others with a misfortune only to be compared to that which happened in Greece when Ino boiled the seed corn of a whole kingdom, and thus not only lost the crop of that year, but, by the subtle interplay of the laws by which evolution proceeds, set back humanity for a period not to be reckoned in years. Mrs. H. S. Mendenhall of Georgetown wrote to Dr. Avery on the evening of election day:

Before this reaches you the telegraph will have given you the result of the day's work all over the State, but I thought I would jot down a line while the experiences of the last ten hours were fresh in my mind. Last evening our committee appointed ladies to represent the interests of woman suffrage at the polls. To my surprise, many evaded the work who were, nevertheless, strongly in favor of the measure. Mrs. Dr. Collins and I were the only ones at the lowest and most important precinct until one o'clock, when we were joined by the wife of the Presbyterian minister. Our course was somewhat as follows: On the approach of a voter, we would ask him, "have you voted?" If he had, we usually troubled him no further; if he had not, we asked, "Can you vote for woman suffrage?" If he approved, we supplied him with his ticket; if he disapproved, we asked him for his objections, and we have listened to some comical ones to-day. One man asked me, though not rudely, "Who is cooking your husband's dinner?" I promptly invited him to dine with us. Another spoke of neglected household duties, and when I mentioned a loaf of bread I had just baked, and should be glad to have him see, he said, "I expect you can bake bread," but he voted against us. The Methodist men were for us; the Presbyterians and Episcopalians very fairly so, and the Roman Catholics were not all against us, some of the prominent members of that church working and voting for woman suffrage. The liquor interest went entirely against us, as far as I know.

The observations of the day have led me to several general conclusions, to which, of course, exceptions exist: (1) Married men will vote for suffrage if their wives appreciate its importance. (2) Men without family ties, and especially if they have associated with a bad class of women, will vote against it. (3) Boys who have just reached their majority will vote against it more uniformly than any other class of men. We were treated with the utmost respect by all except the last class. Destitute of experience, and big with their own importance, these young sovereigns will speak to a woman twice their years with a flippancy which the most ignorant foreigner of mature age would not use, and I have to-day been tempted to believe that no one is fitted to exercise the American franchise under twenty-five years of age.

The main objection which I heard repeatedly urged was, women do not want to vote. This seems to be the great stumbling-block to our brethren. Men were continually saying that their wives told them not to vote for woman suffrage. If we are defeated this time I know we can succeed in the next campaign, or just as soon as we can educate enough prominent women up to the point of coming out plainly on the subject. Then all men, or all but the vicious men who always vote against every good thing, will give in right away.

Lucy Stone, in a letter to the *Woman's Journal* describes similar scenes enacted that day in Denver; speaks of the order and quiet prevailing at the polls, of the flowers on all the tables, and, in spite of the strangeness of the occasion, of the presence of women as evidently a new and benificent element there. Rev. Dr. Ellis of the Baptist Church, who, on the Sunday before had preached from the text, "Help those Women," was using his influence to convert those doubtful or opposed. Rev. Mr.

Bliss, who had declared in his pulpit that "the only two women the Bible mentioned as having meddled in politics were Jezebel and Herodias," was there also, to warn men not to vote for equal rights for women. At other polls I saw colored men, once slaves, electioneering and voting against the rights of women. When remonstrated with, one said: "We want the women at home cooking our dinners." A shrewd colored woman asked whether they had provided any dinner to cook, and added that most of the colored women there had to earn their dinner as well as cook it.

* * * * * * * * *

Hear the conclusion of the whole matter. In the words of the last editorial of the woman's column in the *Rocky Mountain News:*

Woman's hour has not yet struck! The chimes that were waiting to ring out the tidings of her liberty—the candles furtively stored against an illumination which should typify a new influx of light, the achievement of a victory whose meaning and promise at least seemed to those who both prayed and worked for it, neither trivial nor selfish—all these are relegated to the guardianship of Patience and Hope. Colorado has refused to enfranchise its women. * * * * * * The Germans, the Catholics, and the negroes were said to be against us. Naturally, those who themselves most keenly feel, or most recently have felt, the galling yoke of arbitrary rule, are most disposed to derive a certain enjoyment from the daily contemplation of a noble class still in bondage. * * * * * But *all* opposition, in whatever guise, comes back at last to be written under one rubric—the immaturity of woman. We make this dispassionate statement of a fact. We feel neither scorn nor anger, and we trust that we shall excite none. It is a fault which time will cure, but meantime it is the grand factor in our account. Every other argument has been met—every other stronghold of opposition taken. Woman's claim to the ballot has been shown to rest in justice on the very foundation stone of democratic government—has been, from the Christian standpoint, as completely exonerated from the charge of impiety as ever anti-slavery and anti-polygamy were, and the fact which was the slogan of the anti-suffragists still remains: the mass of the women do not want it. We do not quarrel with the fact, but state it to give the real reason for our failures—the real objective point for our future work.

The complacency with which we are able to state without fear of contradiction that the body of intelligent and thoughtful women *do* want suffrage must not obscure our perception of the equal truth of what we have just stated above. To accept this verity and turn our energies toward the emancipation of our own sex—toward their emancipation from frivolous aims, petty prejudices, and that attitude toward the other sex which is really the sycophancy born of vanity and weakness; to make them recognize the State as a multiplication of their own families, and patriotism as the broadening of their love of home; to make them see that that mother will be most respected whose son does not, when a downy beard is grown, suddenly tower above her in the supercilious enjoyment of an artificial superiority—a superiority which consists simply, as Figaro says, in his having taken the trouble to be born; to make them see, finally, that in the highest exercise of all the powers with which God has endowed her, woman can no more refuse the duties of citizenship, than she can refuse the duties of wifehood and motherhood, once having accepted those sacred relations. This is our first duty, and this the scope of our work, if we would attain suffrage in 1879, or even in 1900.

CHAPTER LII.

WYOMING.

The Dawn of the New Day, December, 1869—The Goal Reached in England and America—Territory Organized, May, 1869—Legislative Action—Bill for Woman Suffrage—William H. Bright—Gov. Campbell Signs the Bill—Appoints Esther Morris, Justice of the Peace, March, 1870—Women on the Jury, Chief-Justice Howe, Presiding—J. W. Kingman, Associate-Justice, Addresses the Jury—Women Promptly take their Places—Sunday Laws Enforced—Comments of the Press—Judge Howe's Letter—Laramie *Sentinel*—J. H. Heyford—Women Voting, 1870—Grandma Swain the First to Cast her Ballot—Effort to Repeal the Law, 1871—Gov. Campbell's Veto—Mr. Corlett—Rapid Growth of Public Opinion in Favor of Woman Suffrage.

AFTER recording such a long succession of disappointments and humiliations for women in all the States in their worthy endeavors for higher education, for profitable employment in the trades and professions and for equal social, civil and political rights, it is with renewed self-respect and a stronger hope of better days to come that we turn to the magnificent territory of Wyoming, where the foundations of the first true republic were laid deep and strong in equal rights to all, and where for the first time in the history of the race woman has been recognized as a sovereign in her own right—an independent, responsible being—endowed with the capacity for self-government. This great event in the history of human progress transpired in 1869.

Neither the point nor the period for this experiment could have been more fitly chosen. Midway across this vast western continent, on the highest plane of land, rising from three to eight thousand feet above the level of the sea, where gigantic mountain-peaks shooting still higher seem to touch the clouds, while at their feet flow the great rivers that traverse the State in all directions, emptying themselves after weary wanderings into the Pacific ocean at last; such was the grand point where woman was first crowned with the rights of citizenship. And the period was equally marked. To reach the goal of self-government the women of England and America seemed to be vieing with each other in the race, now one holding the advance position, now the

other. And in many respects their struggles and failures were similar. When seeking the advantages of collegiate education, the women of England were compelled to go to France, Austria and Switzerland for the opportunities they could not enjoy in their own country. The women of our Eastern States followed their example, or went to Western institutions for such privileges, granted by Oberlin and Antioch in Ohio, Ann Arbor in Michigan, Washington University in Missouri, and refused in all the colleges of the East. For long years, alike they endured ridicule and bitter persecution to secure a foothold in their universites at home.

Our battles in Parliament and in the Congress of the United States were simultaneous. While nine senators,* staunch and true, voted in favor of woman suffrage in 1866, and women were rolling up their petitions for a constitutional amendment in '68 and '69, with Samuel C. Pomeroy in the Senate and George W. Julian in the House, the women of England, keeping step and time, found their champions in the House of Commons in John Stuart Mill and Jacob Bright in 1867–69, and no sooner were their mammoth petitions presented in parliament than ours were rolled into the halls of congress. At last we reached the goal, the women of England in 1869 and those of Wyoming in 1870. But what the former gained in time the latter far surpassed in privilege. While to the English woman only a limited suffrage was accorded, in the vast territory of Wyoming, larger than all Great Britain, all the rights of citizenship were fully and freely conferred by one act of the legislature —the right to vote at all elections on all questions and to hold any office in the gift of the people.

The successive steps by which this was accomplished are given us by Hon. J. W. Kingman, associate-justice in the territory for several years:

It is now sixteen years since the act was passed giving women the right to vote at all elections in this territory, including all the rights of an elector, with the right to hold office. The language of the statute is broad, and beyond the reach of evasion. It is as follows:

That every woman of the age of twenty-one years, residing in the territory, may, at every election to be holden under the laws thereof, cast her vote; and her rights to the elective franchise, and to hold office, shall be the same, under the election laws of the territory, as those of the electors.

---

* Messrs. Wade, Anthony, Gratz Brown, Buckalew, Cowan, Foster, Nesmith, Patterson, Riddle. See Vol. II., Chapter XVII.

There was no half-way work about it, no quibbling, no grudgingly parting with political power, no fear of consequences, but a manly acknowledgment of equal rights and equal privileges, among all the citizens of the new territory. Nor was this the only act of that first legislature on the subject of equal rights. They passed the following:

AN ACT *to protect married women in their separate property, and the enjoyment of their labor.*

SECTION 1. That all the property, both real and personal, belonging to any married woman as her sole and separate property, or which any woman hereafter married, owns at the time of her marriage, or which any married woman during coverture acquires in good faith from any person other than her husband, by descent or otherwise, together with all the rents, issues, increase and profits thereof, shall, notwithstanding her marriage, be and remain during coverture, her sole and separate property, under her sole control, and be held, owned, possessed and enjoyed by her, the same as though she were sole and unmarried, and shall not be subject to the disposal, control or interference of her husband, and shall be exempt from execution or attachment for the debts of her husband.

SEC. 2. Any married woman may bargain, sell, and convey, her personal property, and enter into any contract in reference to the same, as if she were *sole*.

SEC. 3. Any woman may, while married, sue and be sued in all matters having relation to her property, person or reputation, in the same manner as if she were *sole*.

SEC. 4. Any married woman may, while married, make a will the same as though she were *sole*.

SEC. 5. Any married woman may carry on any trade or business, and perform any labor or service on her sole and separate account, and the earnings of any married woman from her trade, business, labor or services, shall be her sole and separate property, and may be used and invested by her in her own name; and she may sue and be sued, as if *sole*, in regard to her trade, business, labor, services, and earnings. * * *

SEC. 9. The separate deed of the husband shall convey no interest in the wife's lands.

Under the statute for distributions, the wife is treated exactly as the husband is; each having the same right in the estate of the other. The provisions are so unusual and peculiar, that I venture to copy some of them:

* * * * If such intestate leave a husband or wife, *and* children, him or her surviving, one-half of such estate shall descend to such surviving husband or wife, and the residue thereof * * * * to the children; if such intestate leave a husband or wife and *no* child, * * * * then the property shall descend as follows, to wit: three-fourths thereof to such remaining husband or wife, and one-fourth thereof to the father and mother of the intestate, or the survivor of them; provided that if the estate of such intestate, real and personal, does not exceed in volume the sum of ten thousand dollars, then the whole thereof shall descend to and rest in the surviving husband or wife as his or her absolute estate. Dower and the tenancy by the curtesy are abolished.

The school law also provides:

SEC. 9. In the employment of teachers no discrimination shall be made, in the question of pay, on account of sex, when the persons are equally qualified.

Such are some of the radical enactments of the first legislature of Wyoming territory in reference to woman's rights; and to a person who has grown up under the common law and the usages of English-speaking people, they undoubtedly appear extravagant if not revolutionary, and well calculated to disturb or overthrow the very foundations of social or-

der. Experience has not, however, justified any such apprehensions. The people of Wyoming have prospered under these laws, and are growing to like them better and better, and adapt themselves more and more to their provisions. The object of this sketch is to trace the progress and development of this new legislation, and gather up some of its consequences as they have been observed in our social and political relations.

The territory of Wyoming was first organized in May, 1869. The Union Pacific railroad was completed on the 9th of the month, and the transcontinental route opened to the public. There were but few people in the territory at that time, except such as had been brought hither in connection with the building of that road, and while some of them were good people, well-educated, and came to stay, many were reckless, wicked and wandering. The first election was held in September, 1869, for the election of a delegate in congress, and members of the Council and House of Representatives for the first territorial legislature. There was a good deal of party feeling developed, and election day witnessed a sharp and vigorous struggle. The candidates and their friends spent money freely, and every liquor shop was thrown open to all who would drink. I was about to say that any one could imagine the consequences; but in fact I do not believe that any one could picture to himself the mad follies, and frightful scenes of that drunken election. Peaceful people did not dare to walk the streets, in some of the towns, during the latter part of the day and evening. At South Pass City, some drunken fellows with large knives and loaded revolvers swaggered around the polls, and swore that no negro should vote. One man remarked quietly that he thought the negroes had as good a right to vote as any of them had. He was immediately knocked down, jumped on, kicked and pounded without mercy, and would have been killed, had not his friends rushed into the brutal crowd and dragged him out, bloody and insensible. It was a long time before the poor fellow recovered from his injuries. There were quite a number of colored men who wanted to vote, but did not dare approach the polls until the United States Marshal placed himself at their head and with revolver in hand escorted them through the crowd, saying he would shoot the first man that interfered with them. There was much quarreling and tumult, but the negroes voted. This was only a sample of the day's doings, and characteristic of the election all over the territory. The result was that every Republican was defeated, and every Democratic candidate elected; and the whisky shops had shown themselves to be the ruling power in Wyoming. From such an inspiration one could hardly expect a revelation of much value! Yet there were some fair men among those elected.

The legislature met October 12, 1869. Wm. H. Bright was elected president of the Council. As he was the author of the woman suffrage bill, and did more than all others to secure its passage, some account of him may be of interest. He was a man of much energy and of good natural endowments, but entirely without school education. He said frankly, "I have never been to school a day in my life, and where I learned to read and write I do not know." His character was not above reproach,

but he had an excellent, well-informed wife, and he was a kind, indulgent husband. In fact, he venerated his wife, and submitted to her judgment and influence more willingly than one could have supposed; and she was in favor of woman suffrage.* There were a few other men in that legislature, whose wives exercised a similar influence; but Mr. Bright found it up-hill work to get a majority for his bill, and it dragged along until near the close of the session. The character of the arguments he used, and the means he employed to win success are perhaps worthy of notice, as showing the men he had to deal with. I ought to say distinctly, that Mr. Bright was himself fully and firmly convinced of the justice and policy of his bill, and gave his whole energy and influence to secure its passage; he secured some members by arguing to support their pet schemes in return, and some he won over by even less creditable means. He got some votes by admitting that the governor would veto the bill (and it was generally understood that he would), insisting at the same time, that it would give the Democrats an advantage in future elections by showing that they were in favor of liberal measures while the Republican governor and the Republican party were opposed to them. The favorite argument, however, and by far the most effective, was this: it would prove a great advertisement, would make a great deal of talk, and attract attention to the legislature, and the territory, more effectually than anything else. The bill was finally passed and sent to the governor. I must add, however, that many letters were written from different parts of the territory, and particularly by the women, to members of the legislature, urging its passage and approving its object.

On receipt of the bill, the governor was in great doubt what course to take. He was inclined to veto it, and had so expressed himself; but he did not like to take the responsibility of offending the women in the territory, or of placing the Republican party in open hostility to a measure

* Ex-Governor Hoyt in his public speeches frequently gives this bird's-eye view of Bright's domestic and political discussions: "Betty, it's a shame that I should be a member of the legislature and make laws for such a woman as you. You are a great deal better than I am; you know a great deal more, and you would make a better member of the Assembly than I, and you know it. I have been thinking about it and have made up my mind that I will go to work and do everything in my power to give you the ballot. Then you may work out the rest in your own way." So he went over and talked with other members of the legislature. They smiled. But he got one of the lawyers to help him draw up a short bill, which he introduced. It was considered and discussed. People smiled generally. There was not much expectation that anything of that sort would be done; but this was a shrewd fellow, who managed the party card in such a way as to get, as he believed, enough votes to carry the measure before it was brought to the test. I will show you a little behind the curtain, so far as I can draw it. Thus he said to the Democrats: "We have a Republican governor and a Democratic Assembly. Now, then, if we can carry this bill through the Assembly and the governor vetoes it, we shall have made a point, you know; we shall have shown our liberality and lost nothing. But keep still; don't say anything about it." They promised. He then went to the Republicans and told them that the Democrats were going to support his measure, and that if *they* did not want to lose capital they had better vote for it too. He didn't think there would be enough of them to carry it, but the vote would be on record and thus defeat the game of the other party. And they likewise agreed to vote for it. So when the bill came to a vote it went right through! The members looked at each other in astonishment, for they hadn't intended to do it, *quite*. Then they laughed and said it was a good joke, but they had "got the governor in a fix." So the bill went, in the course of time, to John A. Campbell, who was then governor—the first governor of the territory of Wyoming—and he promptly signed it! His heart was right. He saw that it was long-deferred justice, and so signed it as gladly as Abraham Lincoln wrote *his* name to the Proclamation of Emancipation of the slaves. Of course the women were astounded! If a whole troop of angels had come down with flaming swords for their vindication, they would not have been much more astonished than they were when that bill became a law and the women of Wyoming were thus clothed with the habiliments of citizenship.

which he saw might become of political force and importance. I remember well an interview that Chief-Justice Howe and myself had with him at that time, in which we discussed the policy of the bill, and both of us urged him to sign it with all the arguments we could command. After a protracted consultation we left him still doubtful what he would do.* But in the end he signed it, and drew upon himself the bitter curses of those Democrats who had voted for the bill with the expectation that he would veto it. From this time onward, the measure became rather a Republican than a Democratic principle, and found more of its friends in the former party, and more of its enemies in the latter.

Soon after the passage of the bill, a vacancy occurred in the office of justice of the peace, at South Pass City, the county seat of Sweetwater county, and the home of Mr. Bright and of Mrs. Esther Morris. At the request of the county attorney—who favored woman suffrage—the commissioners, two of whom also approved of it, appointed Mrs. Morris to fill the vacancy. The legislature had vested the appointment of officers, in case of a vacancy, in the county commissioners, but the organic act of congress, creating the territory, provided that the governor "shall commission all officers who shall be appointed under the laws of said territory." Governor Campbell being absent from the territory at the time, the secretary, acting as governor, sent Mrs. Morris her commission. It is due to Secretary Lee to say that he was an earnest advocate of woman's enfranchisement, and labored for the passage of the bill, and gladly embraced the opportunity to confirm a woman in office. The important fact is, however, that Mrs. Morris' neighbors first suggested the appointment that secured her the office, and manfully sustained her during her whole term. She tried between thirty and forty cases, and decided them so acceptably that not one of them was appealed to a higher court; and I know of no one who has held the office of justice of the peace in this territory, who has left a more acceptable record, in all respects, than has Mrs. Esther Morris. Some other appointments of women to office were made, but I do not find that any of them entered upon its duties.

The first term of the District Court, under the statutes passed by the first legislature, was to be held at Laramie City, on the first Monday of March, 1870. When the jurors were drawn, a large number of women were selected, for both grand and petit jurors. As this was not done by the friends of woman suffrage, there was evidently an intention of making the whole subject odious and ridiculous, and giving it a death-blow at the outset. A great deal of feeling was excited among the people, and some effort made to prejudice the women against acting as jurors, and even threats, ridicule and abuse, in some cases, were indulged in. Their husbands were more pestered and badgered than the women, and some of them were so much inflamed that they declared they would never live with their wives again if they served on the jury. The fact that women

* No sooner had these gentlemen left than Mrs. Post and Mrs. Arnold had a long interview with the governor, urging him to sign the bill on the highest moral grounds; not only to protect the personal rights of the women of the territory but to compel the men to observe the decencies of life and to elevate the social and political status of the people.—[E. C. S.

were drawn as jurors was telegraphed all over the country, and the newspapers came loaded with hostile and uncomplimentary criticisms. At this stage of the case Col. Downey, the prosecuting attorney for the county, wrote to Judge Howe for advice and direction as to the eligibility of the women as jurors, and what course should be taken in the premises. At first Judge Howe was much inclined to order the women discharged, and new juries drawn; and it certainly required no small amount of moral courage to face the storm of ridicule and abuse that was blowing from all quarters. We had a long consultation, and came to the conclusion that since the law had clearly given all the rights of electors to the women of the territory, they must be protected in the exercise of these rights if they chose to assume them; that under no circumstances could the judges permit popular clamor to deprive the women of their legal rights in the very presence of the courts themselves. The result was that Judge Howe wrote the county attorney the following letter:

CHEYENNE, March 3, 1870.

S. W. DOWNEY—*My Dear Sir:* I have your favor of yesterday, and have carefully considered the question of the eligibility of women who are "citizens," to serve on juries. Mr. Justice Kingman has also considered the question, and we concur in the opinion that such women are eligible. My reason for this opinion will be given at length, if occasion requires. I will thank you to make it known to those ladies who have been summoned on the juries, that they will be received, protected, and treated with all the respect and courtesy due, and ever paid, by true American gentlemen to true American ladies, and that the Court, in all the power of government, will secure to them all that deference, security from insult, or anything which ought to offend the most refined woman, which is accorded in any walks of life in which the good and true women of our country have heretofore been accustomed to move. Thus, whatever may have been, or may now be thought of the policy of admitting women to the right of suffrage and to hold office, they will have a fair opportunity, at least in my Court, to demonstrate their ability in this new field, and prove the policy or impolicy of occupying it. Of their right to try it I have no doubt. I hope they will succeed, and the Court will certainly aid them in all lawful and proper ways. Very respectfully,

J. H. HOWE, *Chief-Justice.*

When the time came to hold the court, Judge Howe, whose duty it was to preside, requested me to go with him to Laramie City, and sit with him during the term. I gladly availed myself of the opportunity. As soon as we arrived there, Judge Howe was waited on by a number of gentlemen who endeavored to induce him to order the discharge of the female jurors without calling them into court. Some spoke of the impolicy of the proceeding, and said the women all objected to it and wished to be excused; while some were cross, and demanded the discharge of their wives, saying that it was an intentional insult and they would not submit to it. But Judge Howe told them all firmly, that the women must come into court, and if, after the whole question was fairly explained to them, they chose to decline, they should be excused. At the opening of the court next morning, the house was crowded, and the female jurors were all there. After the usual preliminaries, an attorney arose and moved that all the women summoned as jurors be excused, saying he made the motion at the request of the women themselves; and that he was assured they did not wish to serve. Judge Howe then requested me to express my opinion

and make some remarks to the women on the duties devolving on them. I said:

It was a real pleasure to me to see ladies in the court-room, with the right to take a responsible part in the proceedings, as grand and petit jurors; that no one knew so well as they did, the evils our community suffered from lawless and wicked people; and no one better understood the difficulties the court labored under in its efforts to administer justice and punish crime; that the time had come when the good women of the territory could give us substantial aid, and we looked to them especially, as the power which should make the court efficient in the discharge of its duties; that the new law had conferred on them important rights, and corresponding duties necessarily devolved upon them; that I hoped and believed they would not shrink when so many influences were calling on them for noble and worthy action; that if they failed us now, the cause of equal rights would suffer at their hands, not only in our territory, but in every land where its advocates were struggling for its recognition; that if they would remain, their presence would secure a degree of decorum in the court-room and add a dignity to the proceedings, which the judges had been unable to command; that we required the assistance of good women all over the territory, and I begged them to help us.

Judge Howe then spoke as follows:

It is an innovation and a great novelty to see, as we do to-day, ladies summoned to serve as jurors. The extension of political rights and franchise to women is a subject that is agitating the whole country. I have never taken an active part in these discussions, but I have long seen that woman is a victim to the vices, crimes and immoralities of man, with no power to protect and defend herself from these evils. I have long felt that such powers of protection should be conferred upon woman, and it has fallen to our lot here to act as the pioneers in the movement and to test the question. The eyes of the whole world are to-day fixed upon this jury of Albany county. There is not the slightest impropriety in any lady occupying this position, and I wish to assure you that the fullest protection of the court shall be accorded to you. It would be a most shameful scandal that in our temple of justice and in our courts of law, anything should be permitted which the most sensitive lady might not hear with propriety and witness. And here let me add that it will be a sorry day for any man who shall so far forget the courtesy due and paid by every American gentleman to every American lady as to ever by word or act endeavor to deter you from the exercise of those rights with which the law has invested you. I conclude with the remark that this is a question for you to decide for yourselves. No man has any right to interfere. It seems to me to be eminently proper for women to sit upon grand juries, which will give them the best possible opportunities to aid in suppressing the dens of infamy which curse the country. I shall be glad of your assistance in the accomplishment of this object. I do not make these remarks from distrust of any of the gentlemen. On the contrary, I am exceedingly pleased and gratified with the indication of intelligence, love of law and good order, and the gentlemanly deportment which I see manifested here.

The ladies were then told that those who could not conveniently serve, and those who insisted on being excused, might rise and they should be discharged. Only one rose and she was excused. But a victory had been won of no small moment. Seeing the earnestness of the judges and the dignified character they had given to the affair, the women were encouraged and pleased, and the enemies of equal rights, who had planned, as they thought, a stunning blow to further progress, were silenced and defeated. The current set rapidly in the other direction and applause, as usual, followed success. The business of the court proceeded with marked improvement. The court-room, always crowded, was quiet and decorous in the extreme. The bar in particular was always on its good

behavior, and wrangling, abuse and buncome speeches were not heard. When men moved about they walked quietly, on tip-toe, so as to make no noise, and forbore to whisper or make any demonstrations in or around the court-room. The women when called took their chairs in the jury-box with the men, as they do their seats in church,* and no annoyance or reluctance was visible from the bench. They gave close and intelligent attention to the details of every case, and the men who sat with them evidently acted with more conscientious care than usual. The verdicts were generally satisfactory, except to convicted criminals. They did not convict every one they tried, but "no guilty man escaped," if there was sufficient evidence to hold him. The lawyers soon found out that the usual tricks and subterfuges in criminal cases would not procure acquittal, and they began to challenge off all the women called. The court check-mated this move by directing the sheriff to summon other women in their places, instead of men, and then came motions for continuances. The result was a great success and was so acknowledged by all disinterested persons. On the grand jury were six women and nine men, and they became such a terror to evil-doers that a stampede began among them and very many left the town forever. Certainly there was never more fearless or efficient work performed by a grand jury.

The legislature copied most of the statutes which it enacted from the laws of Nebraska, and among others the following clauses in the crimes act, to wit.:

> If any person shall keep open any tippling or gaming-house on the Sabbath day or night, * * * he shall be fined not exceeding one hundred dollars, or imprisoned in the county jail not exceeding six months.
>
> Any person who shall hereafter knowingly disturb the peace and good order of society by labor on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday (works of necessity and charity excepted), shall be fined, on conviction thereof, in any sum not exceeding fifty dollars.

No attention whatever had been paid to these statutes, and Sunday was generally the great drinking day of the whole week; the saloons sold more whiskey and made more money that day than any other. The women on that grand jury determined to put a stop to it and enforce these laws. They therefore indicted every liquor saloon in town. This made a great outcry, not only among the liquor-sellers but among their customers also. They were all arrested, brought into court and gave bail; but Judge Howe told them as this was a new law recently passed, and as it was quite probable that most of them were ignorant of its provisions, he would continue the cases with this express understanding, that if they would strictly obey the law in future these cases should be dismissed; but

* In the summer of 1871 Mrs. Stanton and myself, *en route* for California, visited Wyoming and met the women who were most active in the exercise of their rights of citizenship. At Cheyenne we were the guests of Mrs. M. B. Arnold and Mrs. Amalia B. Post. Mrs. Arnold had a large cattle-ranch and Mrs. Post an equally large sheep-ranch a few miles out of the city, which they superintended, and from which each received an independent income. They had not only served as jurors, but acted as foremen. At Laramie we were the guests of Mr. J. H. Hayford, editor of the *Laramie Sentinel*, and met Grandma Swain, who was the first woman to cast her ballot in that city. We also met Judges Howe and Kingman and Governor Campbell, and heard from them of the wonderful changes wrought in the court-room and at the polls by the presence of enfranchised women. We spoke in the very court-room in which women had sat as jurors and felt an added inspiration from that fact.—[S. B. A.

if any of them violated it, these cases would be tried and the full penalty inflicted. They all agreed to this, and the "Sunday Law," as it was called, was carefully observed afterwards in Laramie City; and so great has been the change in that town in the habits of the people and the quiet appearance of the streets on Sunday, as compared with other towns in the territory, that it has been nick-named the "Puritan town" of Wyoming, and, I may add, rejoices in its singularity.

And how was this most successful experiment in equal rights received and treated by the press and the people out of the territory? The New York illustrated papers made themselves funny with caricatures of female juries, and cheap scribblers invented all sorts of scandals and misrepresentations about them. The newspapers were overflowing with abuse and adverse criticism, and only here and there was a manly voice heard in apology or defense. I copy these extracts as a sample of the rest.

"LADY JURORS."—Under this head the New Orleans *Times*, the ablest and largest paper in the South, said:

Confusion is becoming worse confounded by the hurried march of events. Mad theorizings take the form of every-day realities, and in the confusion of rights and the confusion of dress, all distinctions of sex are threatened with swift obliteration. When Anna Dickinson holds forth as the teacher of strange doctrines in which the masculinity of woman is preposterously asserted as a true warrant for equality with man in all his political and industrial relations; when Susan B. Anthony flashes defiance from lips and eyes which refuse the blandishment and soft dalliance that in the past have been so potent with "the sex"; when, in fine, the women of Wyoming are called from their domestic firesides to serve as jurors in a court of justice, a question of the day, and one, too, of the strangest kind, is forced on our attention. From a careful review of all the surroundings, we think the Wyoming experiment will lead to beneficial results. By proving that lady jurors are altogether impracticable—that they cannot sit as the peers of men without setting at defiance all the laws of delicacy and propriety—the conclusion may be reached that it will be far better to let nature alone in regulating the relations of the sexes.

The Philadelphia *Press* had the following:

WOMEN AS JURORS.—Now one of the adjuncts of female citizenship is about to be tested in Wyoming. Eleven women have been drawn as jurors to serve at the March term of the Albany County Court. It is stated that immense excitement has been created thereby, but the nature of the aforesaid excitement does not transpire. Will women revolutionize justice? What is female justice, or what is it likely to be? Would twelve women return the same verdict as twelve men, supposing that each twelve had heard the same case? Is it possible for a jury of women, carrying with them all their sensitiveness, sympathies, predilections, jealousies, prejudices, hatreds, to reach an impartial verdict? Would not every criminal be a monster, provided not a female? Can the sex, ordinarily so quick to pronounce pre-judgments, divest itself of them sufficiently to enter the jury-box with unbiased minds? Perhaps it were best to trust the answer to events. Women may learn to be jurymen, but in so doing they have a great deal to learn.

So persistent were the attacks and so malignant were the perversions of truth that Judge Howe, at the request of the editor, wrote the following letter for publication anonymously in the Chicago *Legal News*, every statement in which I can confirm from my own observation. The Judge, after writing the letter, consented to its publication over his own signature:

Digitized by Google

CHEYENNE, Wyoming, April 4, 1870.

Mrs. Myra Bradwell, Chicago, Ill.:

DEAR MADAM: I am in receipt of your favor of March 26, in which you request me to "give you a truthful statement, over my own signature, for publication in your paper, of the history of, and my observations in regard to, women as grand and petit jurors in Wyoming." I will comply with your request, with this qualification, that it be not published over my own signature, as I do not covet newspaper publicity, and have already, without any agency or fault of my own, been subjected to an amount of it which I never anticipated nor conceived of, and which has been far from agreeable to me.

I had no agency in the enactment of the law in Wyoming conferring legal equality upon women. I found it upon the statute-book of that territory, and in accordance with its provisions several women were legally drawn by the proper officers on the grand and petit juries of Albany county, and were duly summoned by the sheriff without any agency of mine. On being apprised of these facts, I conceived it to be my plain duty to fairly enforce this law, as I would any other; and more than this, I resolved at once that, as it had fallen to my lot to have the experiment tried under my administration, it should have a fair trial, and I therefore assured these women that they could serve or not, as they chose; that if they chose to serve, the Court would secure to them the most respectful consideration and deference, and protect them from insult in word or gesture, and from everything which might offend a modest and virtuous woman in any of the walks of life in which the good and true women of our country have been accustomed to move.

While I had never been an advocate for the law, I felt that thousands of good men and women had been, and that they had a right to see it fairly administered; and I was resolved that it should not be sneered down if I had to employ the whole power of the court to prevent it. I felt that even those who were opposed to the policy of admitting women to the right of suffrage and to hold office would condemn me if I did not do this. It was also sufficient for me that my own judgment approved this course.

With such assurances these women chose to serve and were duly impanelled as jurors. They were educated, cultivated eastern ladies, who are an honor to their sex. They have, with true womanly devotion, left their homes of comfort in the States to share the fortunes of their husbands and brothers in the far West and to aid them in founding a new State beyond the Missouri.

And now as to the results. With all my prejudices against the policy, I am under conscientious obligations to say that these women acquitted themselves with such dignity, decorum, propriety of conduct and intelligence as to win the admiration of every fair-minded citizen of Wyoming. They were careful, pains-taking, intelligent and conscientious. They were firm and resolute for the right as established by the law and the testimony. Their verdicts were right, and, after three or four criminal trials, the lawyers engaged in defending persons accused of crime began to avail themselves of the right of peremptory challenge to get rid of the female jurors, who were too much in favor of enforcing the laws and punishing crime to suit the interests of their clients. After the grand jury had been in session two days, the dance-house keepers, gamblers and *demi-monde* fled out of the city in dismay, to escape the indictment of women grand jurors! In short I have never, in twenty-five years of constant experience in the courts of the country, seen more faithful, intelligent and resolutely honest grand and petit juries than these.

A contemptibly lying and silly dispatch went over the wires to the effect that during the trial of A. W. Howie for homicide (in which the jury consisted of six women and six men) the men and women were kept locked up together all night for four nights. Only two nights intervened during the trial, and on these nights, by my order, the jury was taken to the parlor of the large, commodious and well-furnished hotel of the Union Pacific Railroad, in charge of the sheriff and a woman bailiff, where they were supplied with meals and every comfort, and at 10 o'clock the women were conducted by the bailiff to a large and suitable apartment where beds were prepared for them,

and the men to another adjoining, where beds were prepared for them, and where they remained in charge of sworn officers until morning, when they were again all conducted to the parlor and from thence in a body to breakfast, and thence to the jury-room, which was a clean and comfortable one, carpeted and heated, and furnished with all proper conveniences.

The cause was submitted to the jury for their decision about 11 o'clock in the forenoon, and they agreed upon their verdict, which was received by the court between 11 and 12 o'clock at night of the same day, when they were discharged.

Everybody commended the conduct of this jury and was satisfied with the verdict, except the individual who was convicted of murder in the second degree. The presence of these ladies in court secured the most perfect decorum and propriety of conduct, and the gentlemen of the bar and others vied with each other in their courteous and respectful demeanor toward the ladies and the court. Nothing occurred to offend the most refined lady (if she was a sensible lady) and the universal judgment of every intelligent and fair-minded man present was and is, that the experiment was a success.

I dislike the notoriety this matter has given me, but I do not shrink from it. I never sought it nor expected it, and have only performed what I regarded as a plain duty, neither seeking nor desiring any praise, and quite indifferent to any censure or criticism which my conduct may have invoked.

Thanking you for your friendly and complimentary expressions, I am very respectfully yours, J. H. Howe.

As showing how the matter was received at home, in Laramie City, I copy the following from the *Laramie Sentinel* of April 7, 1870:

If we should neglect to give some idea of the results of our jury experiment, the world would say we were afraid or ashamed of it. For our own part we are inclined to admit that it succeeded beyond all our expectations. We naturally wished it to succeed; still we scarcely wished it to demonstrate a theory that women were *better* qualified for these duties than men. Hence, when Chief-Justice Howe said, "In eighteen years' experience I have never had as fair, candid, impartial and able a jury in court, as in this term in Albany county," and when Associate-Justice Kingman said, "For twenty-five years it has been an anxious study with me, both on the bench and at the bar, how we are to prevent jury trials from degenerating into a perfect burlesque, and it has remained for Albany county to point out the remedy and demonstrate the cure for this threatened evil," we confess to having been *more* than satisfied with the result. It may be safely stated as the unanimous verdict of bench, bar and public opinion, that the jurors of Albany county did well and faithfully discharge their duties, with honor and credit to themselves and to the satisfaction of the public.

Among the few exceptions to the general abuse of the press, the following from the Cincinnati *Gazette* of April 14, 1870, is well worth preserving:

Now, in the name of the inalienable right of every person to the pursuit of happiness, we have to ask: Are not these women competent to decide for themselves whether their households, their children or their husbands are of more importance than their public duties? And having the best means for deciding this question, have they not the right to decide? Who has the right to pick out the females of a jury and challenge them with the question whether they are not neglecting their households or their husbands? Who challenges a male juror and demands whether he left his family well provided, and his wife well cherished? or if, through his detention in court, the cupboard will be bare, the wife neglected, or the children with holes in their trousers? This is simply the crack of the familiar whip of man's absolute domination over women. It means nothing short of their complete subjection. Not to use rights is to abandon them. There are inconveniences and cares in all possessions; but who argues that therefore they should be abandoned? It would much promote the convenience of man if he would let his political rights and duties be performed by a few willing persons; but he would soon find that he had no rights left.

And what is this family impediment which is thus set up as a female disability? The family obligation is just as strong in man as in woman. It is much stronger, for the manners which compel woman to be the passive waiter on the male providence leave to him the real responsibility. Yet many men forego marriage and homes and children, and nobody imagines that it disqualifies them for public duties. Nobody challenges them as jurors, and demands if they have discharged the family obligation. Rather it is held wise in them to give themselves wholly to their pursuits, without the distraction of conjugal joys, until they have achieved success. Why should the family requirement, which man throws off so easily, be made a yoke for woman? There is something more fundamental than nursing babies or coddling the appetites of husbands. The sentiment, "Give me liberty, or give me death," is the American instinct. Breathes there a woman with soul so dead that she would bring forth slaves? Babes had better not be born if they are not to have their rights. It is the duty of women to first provide the state of freedom for their progeny. Then they may consent to become wives and mothers. Liberty and the exercise of all political rights are so bound together, that to neglect one is to abandon all. Trial by a jury of one's peers is the essential principle of the administration of justice. To be a peer on a jury involves the whole principle of equal rights. To abandon this to man, is to accept subjection to man.

For women to neglect jury duty is to give men the exclusive privilege to *judge women*, and to abandon the right to be tried by a jury of their peers. How can men justly judge a woman? They cannot have that knowledge of her peculiar physical and mental organization which is requisite to the judgment of motives and temptations. They cannot comprehend the variable moods and emotions, nor the power of her impulses. It is monstrous injustice to judge women by the same rules as men. And men lack that intuitive charity and tender sympathy which women always feel for an exposed, erring sister. Furthermore, many of the crimes of men are against women. How can men appreciate their injury? That which is her ruin, they call, as Anna Dickinson says, sowing their wild oats. How can justice be expected from those who instinctively combine to preserve their privilege to abuse women? For the administration of justice to women who are accused, and to men who have wronged women, judges and jurors of their own sex are indispensable.

As long as Judge Howe remained on the bench he had women on his juries.* His first term at Cheyenne, after the law was passed, several women were among the jurors, and they did fully as well, and exerted quite as good an influence there, as the women had recently at Laramie City.

The first election under the woman suffrage law was held in September, 1870, for the election of a delegate in congress, and county officers. There was an exciting canvass, and both parties applied to the whisky shops, as before, supposing they would wield the political power of the territory, and that not enough women would vote to influence the result. The morning of election came, but did not bring the usual scenes around the polls. A few women came out early to vote, and the crowd kept entirely out of sight. There was plenty of drinking and noise at the saloons, but the men would not remain, after voting, around the polls. It seemed more like Sunday than election day. Even the negro men and women voted without objection or disturbance. Quite a number of women voted during the day, at least in all the larger towns, but apprehension of a re-

* The following is the list of the first grand jury at Laramie City, composed of nine men and six women, as impanneled and sworn: C. H. Bussard, foreman; Mrs. Jane E. Hilton, T. W. DeKay, Jeremiah Boies, Mrs. H. C. Swain, Joseph DeMars, M. N. Merrill, Mrs. M. A. Pierce, Mrs. C. Blake, Richard Turpin, G. W. Cardwell, Mrs. S. L. Larimer, N. C. Worth, Mrs. Jane Mackle, W. H. Mitchell.

Digitized by Google

petition of the scenes of the former election, and doubt as to the proper course for them to pursue, kept very many from voting. The result was a great disappointment all around. The election had passed off with unexpected quiet, and order had everywhere prevailed. The whisky shops had been beaten, and their favorite candidate for congress, although he had spent several thousand dollars to secure an election, was left out in the cold. I cannot deny myself the pleasure of quoting at length the following letter of the Rev. D. J. Pierce, at that time a resident of Laramie City, and a very wealthy man, to show the powerful influence that was exerted on the mind of a New England clergyman by that first exhibition of women at the polls, and as evidence of the singular and beneficial change in the character of the election, and the conduct of the men:

Editor Laramie Sentinel: I am pleased to notice your action in printing testimonials of different classes to the influence of woman suffrage in Wyoming. With the apathy of conservatism and prejudice of party spirit arrayed against the idea in America, it is the duty of the residents in Wyoming to note the simple facts of their noted experiment, and lay them before the world for its consideration. I came from the vicinity of Boston, arriving in Laramie two weeks before the first regular election of 1870. I had never sympathized with the extreme theories of the woman's rights platform, to the advocates of which I had often listened in Boston. But I had never been able to learn just why a woman is naturally excluded from the privilege of franchise, and I sometimes argued in favor in lyceum debates. Still the question of her degradation stared me in the face, and I came to Wyoming unsettled in the matter, determined to be an impartial judge. I was early at the polls, but too late to witness the polling of the first female vote—by "Grandma" Swain, a much-esteemed Quaker lady of 75 summers, who determined by her words and influence to rally her sex to defend the cause of morality and justice.

I saw the rough mountaineers maintaining the most respectful decorum whenever the women approached the polls, and heard the timely warning of one of the leading canvassers as he silenced an incipient quarrel with uplifted finger, saying, "Hist! Be quiet! A woman is coming!"

And I was compelled to allow that in this new country, supposed at that time to be infested by hordes of cut-throats, gamblers and abandoned characters, I had witnessed a more quiet election than it had been my fortune to see in the quiet towns of Vermont. I saw ladies attended by their husbands, brothers, or sweethearts, ride to the places of voting, and alight in the midst of a silent crowd, and pass through an open space to the polls, depositing their votes with no more exposure to insult or injury than they would expect on visiting a grocery store or meat-market. Indeed, they were much safer here, every man of their party was pledged to shield them, while every member of the other party feared the influence of any signs of disrespect.

And the next day I sent my impressions to an eastern paper, declaring myself convinced that woman's presence at the polls would elevate the tone of public sentiment there as it does in churches, the social hall, or any other place, while her own robes are unspotted by the transcient association with evil characters which she is daily obliged to meet in the street or dry-goods store. My observation at subsequent annual elections has only confirmed my opinion in this respect.

Without reference to party issues, I noticed that a majority of women voted for men of the most temperate habits, thus insuring success to the party of law and order.

After three years' absence from my old home, I could not fail to notice in the elections of 1877 and 1878 that both parties had been led to nominate men of better standing in moral character, in order to secure the female vote.

I confess that I believe in the idea of aristocracy—*i. e.* "the rule of the best ones"

—not by blood or position, but the aristocracy of character, to which our laws point when they declare that prison characters shall not vote.

The ballot of any community cannot rise above its character. A town full of abandoned women would be cursed by the application of woman suffrage.

We need to intrust our State interests to the class most noted for true character. As a class, women are more moral and upright in their character than men. Hence America would profit by their voting. D. J. PIERCE, *Pastor Baptist Church.*

The next general election occurred in September, 1871, for members of the second territorial legislature. The usual tactics were employed and considerable sums of money were given to the drinking saloons to secure their influence and furnish free drinks and cigars for the voters. But no one thought of trying to buy up the women, nor was it ever supposed that a woman's vote could be secured with whiskey and cigars! Election day passed off with entire quiet and good order around the polling-places; the noise and bustle were confined to the bar-rooms. The streets presented no change from an ordinary business day, except that a large number of wagons and carriages were driven about with the watch-words and banners of different parties, or different candidates, conspicuously posted on them. A much larger number of women voted at this election than at the former one, but quite a number failed or refused to take part in it. The result was again a surprise, and to many a disappointment. Some candidates were unexpectedly elected, and some who had spent large amounts of money and worked hard around the drinking saloons, and were ready to bet largely on being elected, were defeated. The Republicans had shown an unexpected strength and had returned several members to each House, although it was quite certain that some of the Democrats were indebted to the women for their success. It was admitted, however, that their votes had generally gone against the favorites of the whiskey shops and that the power of the saloons had been largely neutralized and in some cases entirely overthrown. Some remarkable instances of woman's independence and moral character occurred at this election which I cannot help recording, but must not mention names.

As above stated in reference to the grand jury in Laramie City, the "Sunday law" had there been put into vigorous operation. The evening before the election, and after both the political parties had nominated their candidates for the legislature, the saloon-keepers got together very secretly and nominated a ticket of their own number, pledged to repeal the "Sunday law." This move was not discovered until they began to vote that ticket at the polls next day. Then it was found that the saloons were pushing it with all their influence and giving free drinks to all who would vote it. This aroused the women and they came out in force; many who had declined to vote before not only voted, but went round and induced others to do the same. At noon the rum-sellers' ticket was far ahead and it looked as though it would be elected by a large majority; at the close of the polls at night it was overwhelmingly defeated. In one case the wife of a saloon-keeper who was a candidate on that ticket, told her husband that she would defeat him if she could. He was beaten, and he was man enough to say he was glad of

it—glad he had a wife so much better than he was, and who had so much more influence in town than he had.

Another candidate on that ticket was a saloon-keeper who had grown rich in the traffic, but whose private character was much above the morals of his business. He had recently married a very nice young lady in the East, and she was much excited when she learned how matters were progressing. She told her husband she was ashamed of him and would vote against him, and would enlist all the members of her church against him if she could; and she went to work in earnest and was a most efficient cause of the defeat of the ticket. Her husband also was proud of her, and said it served him right and he was glad of it. I have never heard that the domestic harmony of either of these families was in any way disturbed by these events, but I know that they have prospered and are still successful and happy.

Still the legislature was strongly Democratic. There were four Republicans and five Democrats in the Council, and four Republicans and nine Democrats in the House. When they met in November, 1871, many Democrats were found to be bitterly opposed to woman suffrage and determined to repeal the act; they said it was evident they were losing ground and the Republicans gaining by reason of the women voting, and that it must be stopped. The Republicans were all inclined to sustain the law. Several caucuses were held by the Democrats to determine on their course of action and overcome the opposition in their own ranks. These caucuses were held in one of the largest drinking saloons in Cheyenne and all the power of whiskey was brought to bear on the members to secure a repeal of the woman suffrage act. It required considerable time and a large amount of whiskey, but at last the opposition was stifled and the Democratic party was brought up solid for repeal. A bill was introduced in the House for the purpose, but was warmly resisted by the Republicans and a long discussion followed. It was finally carried by a strict party vote and sent to the Council, where it met with the same opposition and the same result followed. It then went to the governor for his approval. There was no doubt in his mind as to the course he ought to take. He had seen the effects produced by the act of enfranchisement, and unhesitatingly approved all of them. He promptly returned the bill with his veto; and the accompanying message is such an able paper and so fully sets forth the reasons in favor of the original act, and the good results of its operation, that at least a few extracts well deserve a prominent place in this record:

I return herewith to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, a bill for "An Act to repeal Chapter XXXI. of the Laws of the First Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Wyoming."

I regret that a sense of duty compels me to dissent from your honorable body with regard to any contemplated measure of public policy. It would certainly be more in accordance with the desire I have to secure and preserve the most harmonious relations among all the branches of our territorial government, to approve the bill. A regard, however, for the rights of those whose interests are to be affected by it, and for what I believe to be the best interests of the territory, will not allow me to do so. The consideration, besides, that the passage of this bill would be, on the part of those instrumental in bringing it about, a declaration that the principles upon which the

enfranchisement of women is urged are false and untenable, and that our experience demonstrates this, influences me not a little in my present action.

While I fully appreciate the great danger of too much attention to abstract speculation or metaphysical reasoning in political affairs, I cannot but perceive that there are times and circumstances when it is not only proper but absolutely necessary to appeal to principles somewhat general and abstract, when they alone can point out the way and they alone can guide our conduct. So it was when, two years ago, the act which this bill is designed to repeal was presented for my approval. There was at that time no experience to which I might refer and test by its results the conclusions to which the application of certain universally admitted principles led me. In the absence of all such experience I was driven to the application of principles which through the whole course of our national history have been powerfully and beneficially operative in making our institutions more and more popular, in framing laws more and more just and in securing amendments to our federal constitution. If the ballot be an expression of the wish, or a declaration of the will, of the tax-payer as to the manner in which taxes should be levied and collected and revenues disbursed, why should those who hold in their own right a large proportion of the wealth of the country be excluded from a voice in making the laws which regulate this whole subject? If, again, the ballot be for the physically weak a guarantee of protection against the aggression and violence of the strong, upon what ground can the delicate bodily organism of woman be forbidden this shelter for her protection? If, once more, each ballot be the declaration of the individual will of the person casting it, as to the relative merit of opposed measures or men, surely the ability to judge and determine—the power of choice—does not depend upon sex, nor does womanhood deprive of personality. If these principles are too general to be free from criticism, and if this reasoning be too abstract to be always practically applicable, neither the principles nor the reasoning can fail of approbation when contrasted with the gloomy misgivings for the future and the dark forebodings of evils, imaginary, vague and undefined, by dwelling upon which the opponents of this reform endeavor to stay its progress. Aggressive reasoning and positive principles like these must be met with something more than mere doubtful conjectures, must be resisted by something more than popular prejudices, and overthrown—if overthrown at all—by something stronger than the force of inert conservatism; yet what is there but conjecture, prejudice and conservatism opposing this reform? * * * * * * * *

The law granting to women the right to vote and to hold office in this territory was a natural and logical sequence to the other laws upon our statute-book. Our laws give to the widow the guardianship of her minor children. Will you take from her all voice in relation to the public schools established for the education of those children? Our laws permit women to acquire and possess property. Will you forbid them having any voice in relation to the taxation of that property? This bill says too little or too much. Too little, if you legislate upon the assumption that woman is an inferior who should be kept in a subordinate position, for in that case the other laws affecting her should be repealed or amended; and too much, if she is, as no one will deny, the equal of man in heart and mind, for in that case we cannot afford to dispense with her counsel and assistance in the government of the territory.

I need only instance section 9 of the school act, which declares that, "In the employment of teachers no discrimination shall be made in the question of pay on account of sex when the persons are equally qualified." What is more natural than that the men who thought that women were competent to instruct the future voters and legislators of our land, should take the one step in advance of the public sentiment of yesterday and give to her equal wages for equal work? And when this step had been taken, what more natural than that they should again move forward—this time perhaps a little in advance of the public sentiment of to-day—and give to those whom they consider competent to instruct voters, the right to vote.

To the statement, so often made, that the law which this bill is intended to repeal was passed thoughtlessly and without proper consideration, I oppose the fact to which

I have adverted, that the law perfectly conforms to all the other laws in relation to women upon our statute-book. Studied in connection with the other laws it would seem to have grown naturally from them. It harmonizes entirely with them, and forms a fitting apex to the grand pyramid which is being built up as broadly and as surely throughout all the States of the Union as it has been built up and capped in Wyoming.

The world does not stand still. The dawn of Christianity was the dawn of light for woman. For eighteen centuries she has been gradually but slowly rising from the condition of drudge and servant for man, to become his helpmeet, counselor and companion. As she has been advanced in the social scale, our laws have kept pace with that advancement and conferred upon her rights and privileges with accompanying duties and responsibilities. She has not abused those privileges, and has been found equal to the duties and responsibilities. And the day is not far distant when the refining and elevating influence of women will be as clearly manifested in the political as it now is in the social world.

Urged by all these considerations of right, and justice, and expediency, and the strong conviction of duty, I approved that act of which this bill contemplates the repeal, and it became a law. To warrant my reconsidering that action, there ought to be in the experience of the last two years something to show that the reasons upon which it was founded were unsound, or that the law itself was wrong or at least unwise and inexpedient. My view of the teachings of this experience is the very reverse of this. Women have voted, and have the officers chosen been less faithful and zealous and the legislature less able and upright? They have sat as jurors, and have the laws been less faithfully and justly administered, and criminals less promptly and adequately punished? Indeed the lessons of this two years' experience fully confirm all that has been claimed by the most ardent advocate of this innovation.

In this territory women have manifested for its highest interests a devotion strong, ardent, and intelligent. They have brought to public affairs a clearness of understanding and a soundness of judgment, which, considering their exclusion hitherto from practical participation in political agitations and movements, are worthy of the greatest admiration and above all praise. The conscience of women is in all things more discriminating and sensitive than that of men; their sense of justice, not compromising or time-serving, but pure and exacting; their love of order, not spasmodic or sentimental merely, but springing from the heart; all these,—the better conscience, the exalted sense of justice, and the abiding love of order, have been made by the enfranchisement of women to contribute to the good government and well-being of our territory. To the plain teachings of these two years' experience I connot close my eyes. I cannot forget the benefits that have already resulted to our territory from woman suffrage, nor can I permit myself even to seem to do so by approving this bill.

There is another, and in my judgment, a serious objection to this bill, which I submit for the consideration and action of your honorable body. It involves a reference to that most difficult of questions, the limitations of legislative power. High and transcendent as that power undoubtedly and wisely is, there are limits which not even it can pass. Two years ago the legislature of this territory conferred upon certain of its citizens valuble rights and franchises. Can a future legislature, by the passage of a law not liable to the objection that it violates the obligation of contracts, take away those rights? It is not claimed, so far as I have been informed, that the persons upon whom these franchises were conferred have forfeited or failed to take advantage of them. But even if such were the case it would be rather a matter for judicial determination than for legislative action. What that dertermination wonld be is clearly indicated in the opinion of Associate-justice Story in the celebrated case of Trustees of Dartmouth College *vs.* Woodward: "The right to be a freeman of a corporation is a valuable temporal right * * It is founded on the same basis as the right of voting in public elections; it is as sacred a right; and whatever might have been the prevalence of former doubts, since the time of Lord Holt, such a right has always been deemed a valuable franchise or privilege."

But even if we concede that these rights once acquired may be taken away, the passage of this bill would be, in my judgment, a most dangerous precedent. Once admit the right of a representative body to disfranchise its own constituents, and who can establish the limits to which that right may not be carried? If this legislature takes from women their franchises or privileges, what is to prevent a future legislature from depriving certain men, or classes of men, that, from any consideration they desire to disfranchise, of the same rights? We should be carefnl how we inaugurate precedents which may "retnrn to plague the inventors," and be used as a pretext for taking away our liberties.

It will be remembered that in my message to the legislature at the commencement of the present session I said: "There is upon our statue book an act granting to the women of Wyoming territory the right of suffrage and to hold office which has now been in force two years. Under its liberal provisions women have voted in the territory, served on juries, and held office. It is simple justice to say that the women, entering for the first time in the history of the country upon these new and untried duties, have conducted themselves with as much tact, sound judgment, and good sense as the men. While it would be claiming more than the facts justify, to say that this experiment, in a limited field, has demonstrated beyond a doubt the perfect fitness of woman, at all times and under all circumstances, for taking a part in the government, it furnishes at least reasonable presumptive evidence in her favor, and she has a right to claim that, so long as none but good results are made manifest, the law should remain unrepealed."

These were no hastily formed conclusions, but the result of deliberation and conviction, and my judgment to-day approves the language I then used. For the first time in the history of our country we have a government to which the noble words of our *Magna Charta* of freedom may be applied,—not as a mere figure of speech, but as expressing a simple grand truth,—for it is a government which "derives all its just powers from the consent of the governed." We should pause long and weigh carefully the probable results of our action before consenting to change this government. A regard for the genius of our institutions, for the fundamental principles of American autonomy, and for the immutable principles of right and justice, will not permit me to sanction this change.

These reasons for declining to give my consent to the bill, I submit with all deference for the consideration and judgment of your honorable body.

J. A. CAMPBELL.

The Republicans in the House made an ineffectual effort to sustain the veto, but the party whip and the power of the saloons were too strong for them, and the bill was passed over the veto by a vote of 9 to 4. It met a different and better fate, however, in the Council, where it was sustained by a vote of 4 to 5, a strict party vote in each case. Mr. Corlett, a rising young lawyer, at that time in the Council and since then a delegate in congress, made an able defense of the suffrage act and resisted its repeal, sustaining the veto with much skill and final success. And there was much need, for the Democrats had made overtures to one of the Republican members of the Council (they lacked one vote) and had obtained a promise from him to vote against the veto; but Mr. Corlett, finding out the fraud in season, reclaimed the fallen Republican and saved the law. It is due to Mr. Corlett to say that he has always been an able and consistent supporter of woman's rights and universal suffrage. He is now the leading lawyer of the territory.

Since that time the suffrage act has grown rapidly in popular favor, and has never been made a party question. The leading men of both parties, seeing its beneficial action, have given it an unqualified approval; and

most, if not all, of its former enemies have become its friends and advocates. Most of the new settlers in the territory, though coming here with impressions or prejudices against it, soon learn to respect its operation, and admire its beneficial results. There is nowhere in the territory a voice raised against it, and it would be impossible to get up a party for its repeal.

The women uniformly vote at all our elections, and are exerting every year a more potent influence over the character of the candidates selected by each party for office, by quietly defeating those most objectionable in point of morals. It is true they are not now summoned to serve on juries, nor are they elected to office; and there are some obvious reasons for this. In the first place, they never push themselves forward for such positions, as the men invariably do; and in the second place, the judges who have been sent to the territory, since the first ones, have not insisted on respecting the women's rights as jurors, and in some cases have objected to their being summoned as such. But these matters will find a remedy by and by. It used to be an important question in the nominating caucuses, "Will this candidate put up money enough to buy the saloons, and catch the loafers and drinkers that they control?" Now the question is, "Will the women vote for this man, if we nominate him?" There have been some very remarkable instances where men, knowing themselves to be justly obnoxious to the women, have forced a nomination in caucus, relying on their money and the drinking shops and party strength to secure an election, who have been taught most valuable lessons by signal defeat at the polls. It would be invidious to call names or describe individual cases, and could answer no necessary purpose. But I would ask particular attention to the following articles, taken from recent newspapers, as full and satisfactory evidence of the truth of these statements, and of the wisdom of granting universal suffrage and equal rights to the citizens of Wyoming territory.

The Laramie City *Daily Sentinel* of December 16, 1878, J. H. Hayford, editor, has the following leading editorial:

For about eight years now, the women of Wyoming territory have enjoyed the same political rights and privileges as the men, and all the novelties of this new departure, all the shock it carried to the sensibilities of the old conservatives, have long since passed away. For a long time—even for years past—we have frequently received letters asking for information as to its practical results here, and still more frequently have received copies of eastern papers with marked articles which purported to be written by persons who resided here, or had visited the territory and witnessed the awful results or the total failure of the experiment. We have usually paid no attention to these false and anonymous scribblers, who took this method to display their shallow wit at the sacrifice of truth and decency. But recently we have received more than the usual number of such missives, and more letters, and from a more respectable source than before, and we take this occasion and method to answer them all at once, and once for always, and do it through the columns of the *Sentinel*, one of the oldest and most widely circulated papers in the territory, because it will be readily conceded that we would not publish here at home, false statements and misrepresentations upon a matter with which all our readers are familiar, and which, if false, could be easily refuted.

We assert here, then, that woman suffrage in Wyoming has been in every particular a complete success.

That the women of Wyoming value as highly the political franchise, and as generally exercise it, as do the men of the territory.

That being more helpless, more dependent and more in need of the protection of good laws and good government than are men, they naturally use the power put into their hands to secure these results.

That they are controlled more by principle and less by party ties than men, and generally cast their votes for the best candidates and the best measures.

That while women in this territory frequently vote contrary to their husbands, we have never heard of a case where the family ties or domestic relations were disturbed thereby, and we believe that among the pioneers of the West there is more honor and manhood than to abuse a wife because she does not think with her husband about politics or religion.

We have never seen any of the evil results growing out of woman suffrage which we have heard predicted for it by its opponents. On the contrary, its results have been only good, and that continually. Our elections have come to be conducted as quietly, orderly and civilly as our religious meetings, or any of our social gatherings, and the best men are generally selected to make and enforce our laws. We have long ago generally come to the conclusion that woman's influence is as wholesome and as much needed in the government of the State as in the government of the family. We do not know of a respectable woman in the territory who objects to or neglects to use her political power, and we do not know of a decent man in the territory who wishes it abolished, or who is not even glad to have woman's help in our government.

Our laws were never respected or enforced, and crime was never punished, or life or property protected until we had woman's help in the jury box and at the polls, and we unhesitatingly say here at home that we do not believe a man can be found who wishes to see her deprived of voice and power, unless it is the one "who fears not God nor regards man," who wants to pursue a life of vice or crime, and consequently fears woman's influence and power in the government. We assert further that the anonymous scribblers who write slanders on our women and our territory to the eastern press, are either fools, who know nothing about what they write, or else belong to that class of whom the poet says:

> "No rogue e'er felt the halter draw
> With good opinion of the law."

We took some pains to track up and find out the author of one of the articles against woman suffrage to which our attention was called, and found him working on the streets of Cheyenne, with a ball and chain to his leg. We think he was probably an average specimen of these writers. And, finally, we challenge residents in Wyoming who disagree with the foregoing sentiments, and who endorse the vile slanders to which we refer, to come out over their own signature and in their own local papers and take issue with us, and our columns shall be freely opened to them.

There are some obvious inferences to be drawn and some rather remarkable lessons to be learned, from the foregoing narrative. In the first place, the responsibilities of self government, with the necessity of making their own laws, was delegated to a people, strangers to each other, with very little experience or knowledge in such matters, and composed of various nationalities, with a very large percentage of the criminal classes. It is a matter of surprise that they should have so soon settled themselves into an orderly community, where all the rights of person and property are well protected, and as carefully guarded and fully respected as in any of our old eastern commonwealths. It is a still greater surprise that a legislature selected by such a constituency, under such circumstances as characterized our first election, and composed of such men as were in fact elected, should have been able to enact a body of laws con-

Digitized by Google

taining so much that was good and practicable, and so little that was injudicious, unwise or vicious.

In the next place, it is evident that there was no public sentiment demanding the passage of the woman suffrage law, and but few advocates of it at that time in the territory; that its adoption, under such circumstances, was not calculated to give it a fair chance to exert a favorable influence in the community, or even maintain itself among the permanent customs and laws of the territory. The prospect was, that it would either remain a dead letter, or be swept away under the ridicule and abuse of the press, and the open attacks of its enemies. But it has withstood all these adverse forces, and from small beginnings has grown to be a permanent power in our politics, a vital institution, satisfactory to all our people. The far-reaching benefits it will yet accomplish can be easily foreseen. To make either individuals or classes respected and induce them to respect themselves, you must give them power and influence, a fair field and full enjoyment of the results of their labors. We have made a very creditable beginning in this direction, so far as woman is concerned, and we have no doubts about the outcome of it. Wyoming treats all her citizens alike, and offers full protection, equal rewards, and equal power, to both men and women.

Again it is very evident that while our women take no active part in the primary nomination of candidates for office, they exercise a most potent influence by the independent manner in which they vote, and the signal defeat they inflict on many unworthy candidates. Their successful opposition to the power of the bar-rooms is a notable and praiseworthy instance of the wise use of newly-acquired rights. The saloon-keepers used to sell themselves to that party, or that man, who would pay the most, and while robbing the candidates, degraded the elections and debauched the electors. So long as it was understood that in order to secure an election it was necessary to secure the rum-shops, good men were left out of the field, and unscrupulous ones were sought after as candidates. The women have already greatly modified this state of affairs and are likely to change it entirely in the end.

Another wonderful consequence which has attended the presence of women at the polls, is the uniform quiet and good order on election day. All the police that could be mustered, could not insure half the decorum that their simple presence has everywhere secured. No man, not even a drunken one, is willing to act like a rowdy when he knows the women will see him. Nor is he at all anxious to expose himself in their presence when he knows he has drank too much. Such men quit the polls, and slink out of the streets, to hide themselves from the eyes of the women in the obscurity of the drinking shops.

Another fact of great importance is the uniform testimony as to woman's success as a juror. It is true that there has been but a limited opportunity, thus far, to establish this as a fact beyond all doubt. But a good beginning has been made, a favorable impression produced, and no bad results have accompanied or followed the experiment. If our jury system of trying cases is to be preserved, as a tolerable method of set-

thing disputes and administering justice in our courts, every one will admit that a great improvement in the character of the jurors must be speedily found. At present, a jury trial is generally regarded as a farce, or something worse. The proof of this is seen in the fact that in most of our courts the judges are required to try all cases without a jury, where the parties to the action consent, and that in a great portion of the cases the parties do consent.

Another notable observation is the rapid growth of opinion in favor of woman suffrage among our people, after its first adoption; but more particularly the change effected in the minds of the new settlers, who come to the territory with old prejudices and fixed notions against it. Neither early education, nor personal bias, nor party rancor, has been able to withstand the overwhelming evidence of its good effects, and of its elevating and purifying influence in our political and social organization.

I must add, in conclusion, that the seventh legislature of our territory has just closed its session of sixty days. It was composed of more members than the earlier legislatures were, there being thirteen in the Council and twenty-six in the House. Many important questions came up for consideration, and a wide field of discussion was traveled over, but not one word was at any time spoken by any member against woman suffrage.

Hon. M. C. Brown, district-attorney for the territory, confirms the testimony given by the judges and Governor Campbell, in a letter to the National Suffrage Convention held in Washington in 1884, which will be found in the pamphlet report of that year.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LIII.

CALIFORNIA.

Liberal Provisions in the Constitution—Elizabeth T. Schenck—Eliza W. Farnham—Mrs. Mills' Seminary, now a State Institution—Jeannie Carr, State Superintendent of Schools—First Awakening—*The Revolution*—Anna Dickinson—Mrs. Gordon Addresses the Legislature, 1868—Mrs. Pitts Stevens Edits *The Pioneer*—First Suffrage Society on the Pacific Coast, 1869—State Convention, January 26, 1870, Mrs. Wallis, President—State Association Formed, Mrs. Haskell of Petaluma, President—Mrs. Gordon Nominated for Senator—In 1871, Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony Visit California—Hon. A. A. Sargent Speaks in Favor of Suffrage for Woman—Ellen Clarke Sargent Active in the Movement—Legislation Making Women Eligible to Hold School Offices, 1873—July 10, 1873, State Society Incorporated, Sarah Wallis, President—Mrs. Clara Foltz—A Bill Giving Women the Right to Practice Law—The Bill Passed and Signed by the Governor—Contest Over Admitting Women into the Law Department of the University—Supreme Court Decision Favorable—Hon. A. A. Sargent on the Constitution and Laws—Journalists and Printers—Silk Culture—Legislative Appropriation—Mrs. Knox Goodrich Celebrates July 4, 1876—Imposing Demonstration—Ladies in the Procession.

THE central figure in the seal of California is the presiding goddess of that State, her spear in one hand, the other resting on her shield, the cabalistic word "Eureka" over her head and a bear crouching quietly at her feet. She seems to be calmly contemplating the magnificent harbor within the Golden Gate. The shadows on the distant mountains, the richly-laden vessels and the floating clouds indicate the peaceful sunset hour, and the goddess, in harmony with the scene is seated at her ease, as if after many weary wanderings in search of an earthly Paradise she had found at last the land of perennial summers, fruits and flowers—a land of wonders, with its mammoth trees, majestic mountain-ranges and that miracle of grandeur and beauty, the Yosemite Valley. Verily it seems as if bounteous Nature in finishing the Pacific Slope did her best to inspire the citizens of that young civilization with love and reverence for the beautiful and grand.

California, admitted to the Union in 1850, owing to the erratic character of her early population, has passed through more vicis-

situdes than any other State, but she secured at last social order, justice in her courts and a somewhat liberal constitution, as far as the personal and property rights of the "white male citizen" were concerned. By its provisions—

All legal distinctions between individuals on religious grounds are prohibited; the utmost freedom of assembling, of speech and of the press is allowed, subject only to restraint for abuse; there is no imprisonment for debt, except where fraud can be proved; slavery and involuntary servitude, except for crime, are prohibited; wives are secured in their separate rights of property; the exemption of a part of the homestead and other property of heads of families from forced sale is recognized.

So far so good; but while the constitution limits the franchise to every "white male citizen" over twenty-one, who has been a resident of the State six months, and thus makes outlaws and pariahs of all the noble women who endured the hardships of the journey by land or by sea to that country in the early days, who helped to make it all that it is, that instrument cannot be said to secure justice, equality and liberty to all its citizens. The position in the constitution and laws of that vast territory, of the real woman who shares the every-day trials and hardships of her sires and sons inspires no corresponding admiration and respect, with the ideal one who gilds and glorifies the great seal of the State.

For the main facts of this chapter we are indebted to Elizabeth T. Schenck.* She says:

Out of the stirring scenes and tragical events characterizing the early days of California one can well understand that there came of necessity many brave and adventurous argonauts and many women of superior mental force, from among whom in after years the woman suffrage cause might receive most devoted adherents. For nearly a score of years after the great incursion of gold-seekers into this newly-acquired State no word was uttered by tongue or pen demanding political equality for women—none at least which reached the public ear. There were no preceding causes, as in the older States, to stimulate the discussion of the question, and even that mental amazon, Eliza W. Farnham who was one of the distinguished pioneers of California, gathered her inspiration from

* Having spent several days with Mrs. Schenck, in her cozy, artistic home surrounded with a hedge of brilliant geraniums, I can readily testify to the many virtues and attractions her large circle of friends has always accorded her. From all I had heard I was prepared to find Mrs. Schenck a woman of remarkable cultivation and research, and I was not disappointed. Refined, honorable in her feeling, clear in her judgments of men and measures, just and upright in all her words and actions, she was indeed the fitting leader for the uprising of women on the Pacific Slope. The preparation of this chapter occupied the last year of her life, her one wish to live was to complete the task, but when her failing powers made that impossible she charged her friend Mrs. Manning, with whom she resided, to take up the work that had fallen from her hands and make a fair record of all that had been done and said, by her noble coadjutors, who had labored so faithfully to inaugurate the greatest reform of the century. —[E. C. S.

afar, and thought and wrote for the whole world of women without once sounding the tocsin for woman's political emancipation. Many of the women who braved the perils of the treacherous deep, or still more terrible dangers of the weary march over broad deserts, inhospitable mountains, and through the fastnesses of hostile and merciless Indians, to reach California in the early times, entertained broad views upon the intellectual capacity and political rights of women, but their efforts were confined to fields of literature. While this advanced guard of progressive women was moulding into form a social system out of the turbulent and disorganized masses thrown together by the rapidly-increasing population from all parts of the globe, the elements were aggregating which in after years produced powerful, outspoken thought and earnest action in behalf of disfranchised women.

Here as elsewhere women took the lead in school matters and were the most capable and efficient educators from the days of "'49." One of our permanent State institutions, Mills' Seminary, was founded by a woman whose name it bears, and who, assisted by her husband, Rev. Mr. Mills, conducted the school for nearly a quarter of a century, until by an act of the legislature, she conveyed it to the State. Several principals of the public schools in San Francisco have held their positions for over twenty consecutive years. Mrs. Jeanne Carr, deputy state superintendent of public instruction from 1871 to 1875, was succeeded by Mrs. Kate M. Campbell, who served most efficiently for the full term. During Mrs. Carr's public service she visited nearly every county in the State, attending teachers' institutes, and lecturing upon educational topics with great ability. For many years women have been eligible to school offices in California and there is not a county in the State where women have not filled positions as trustees or been elected to the office of county superintendent.* Mrs. Coleman has been reëlected to that office in Shasta county, and Mrs. E. W. Sullivan in Mono county has served for several terms.

The first attempt to awaken the public mind to the question of suffrage for woman was a lecture given by Laura De Force Gordon in Platt's Hall, San Francisco, Feburary 19, 1868. Although the attendance was small, a few earnest women were there † who formed the nucleus of what followed. Soon after Mrs. Gordon addressed the legislature in the senate-chamber at Sacramento, and made an eloquent appeal for the political rights of women. Among the audience were many members of the legislature who became very deeply impressed with the justice of her

*Among them are Laura Fowler, Kate Kennedy, Mary N. Wadleigh, Trinity County; Anna L. Spencer, Alpine; Mrs. D. M. Coleman, Shasta; Miss A. L. Irish, Mono; Los Angeles City Board of Education has three women out of its five members, to-wit., Mrs. C. B. Jones (chairman), Mrs. M. A. Hodgkins (secretary), Mrs. M. Graham. Oakland Board, Miss A. Aldrich; Sacramento, Charlotte Slater; San Jose, Mrs. B. L. Hollenbeck. Sister Mary Frances of the order of "Sisters of Charity" came to California in 1849, and devoted her great energies, and rare accomplishments, to the cause of education up to the time of her demise in April, 1881. Annie Haven, Miss Prince, Miss Austin, and a host of others have been successful in the same field of labor, including Miss Merweidel, founder of the kindergarten system in San Francisco.

† Among them were Mrs. Sarah Wallis of Mayfield, Mrs. E. T. Schenck, Mrs. L. M. Clarke, Emily Pitts (afterwards Mrs. Stevens of San Francisco).

demand, including the subsequent governor of the State, George C. Perkins, then senator from Butte county. Soon afterwards Mrs. Gordon removed to Nevada, and no more lectures on woman suffrage were given until the visit of Anna Dickinson in the summer of 1869.

The way was being prepared however, for further agitation by the appearance of *The Revolution* in 1868 in New York, which was hailed by the women of California (as elsewhere) as the harbinger of a brighter and better era. Its well filled pages were eagerly read and passed from hand to hand, and the effect of its startling assertions was soon apparent. Mrs. Pitts Stevens had about that time secured a proprietary interest in the *San Francisco Mercury*, and was gradually educating her readers up to a degree of liberality to endorse suffrage. Early in 1869 she became sole proprietor, changing the name to *Pioneer*, and threw the woman suffrage banner to the breeze in an editorial of marked ability.

The organization of the National Woman Suffrage Association in New York, May, 1869, gave fresh impetus to the movement, and the appointment of Mrs. Elizabeth T. Schenck as vice-president for California by that association, met with the approval of all those interested in the movement. Soon after this Mrs. Schenck with her gifted ally, Mrs. Stevens, decided to organize a suffrage society, and at an impromptu meeting of some of the friends at the residence of Mrs. Nellie Hutchinson, July 27, 1869, the first association for this purpose on the Pacific coast was formed. There were just a sufficient number of members * to fill the offices. This society grew rapidly and within a month the parlors were found inadequate to the constantly increasing numbers. Through the courtesy of the Mercantile Library Association their commodious apartments were secured.

The advent of Anna Dickinson afforded the ladies an opportunity to attest their admiration for her as a representative woman, which they did, giving her a public breakfast, September 14. Their honored guest appreciated the compliment; and in an earnest and eloquent speech referred to it, saying that although she had received many demonstrations of the kind, this was the first ever given her exclusively by her own sex.†

Soon after Miss Dickinson's departure, Mrs. Schenck, much to the regret of the society, resigned the chair, and Mrs. J. W. Stow was appointed to fill the vacancy. The ladies having for some time considered the organizing of a State Society of great importance, it was decided to hold a grand mass convention for that purpose. There was need of funds to carry forward the work, and a course of three lectures was suggested as a means to raise money. This carried, on motion of Mrs. Stow, and her offer to deliver the first lecture of the course was accepted. All the members of the society devoted their energies to secure the success of the undertaking. Many of them engaged in selling tickets for the two weeks inter-

* *President*, Elizabeth T. Schenck; *Vice-President*, Emily Pitts Stevens; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. Hutchinson; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Celia Curtis; *Treasurer*, Mrs S. J. Corbett.

† The following persons were present: Mrs. E. T. Schenck, president of Woman Suffrage Association of San Francisco; Mrs. E. Pitts Stevens, Mrs. Celia Curtis, Mrs. Walton, Mrs. Watson, Mrs. S. J. Corbett, M. D.; Mary Collins, Mrs. E. P. Meade, M. D.; Mrs. Alpheus Bull, Mrs. James S. Bush, Mrs. S. M. Clarke, Mrs. Judge Shafter, Mrs. Judge Burke, Mrs Thomas Varney, Mrs. R. B. Swain, Mrs. Carlton Curtis, Mrs. T. Richardson, Mrs. I. W. Hobson, Mrs. Smythe, Mrs. J. W. Stow, Mrs. C. G. Ames, Mrs. Barry and 30 others.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1914 L

Vincent de Paul Bourdon.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Laura de Force Gordon.

Google

vening, and on November 2, Mrs. Stow gave her lecture to a large and interested audience, taking for her theme, "Woman's Work." The Rev. Mr. Hamilton followed, November 9, with "The Parlor and the Harem," and the Rev. C. G. Ames concluded the course, November 18, with "What Does it Mean?" The lectures were well received, and though not particularly directed to the right of suffrage for women, succeeded in attracting attention to the society under whose auspices they were given, and helped it financially. About this time Mrs. Gordon returned from the East and took an active part in canvassing the State, lecturing and forming county societies preparatory to securing as large a representation as possible at the coming convention. The following report of the proceedings is taken from the San Francisco dailies:

The convention to form a State Woman Suffrage Society, held its first meeting in Dashaway Hall, Wednesday afternoon, January 26, 1870. The hall was well filled. Mrs. E. T. Schenck, vice-president of the National Association, was chosen president, *pro. tem.*, and Miss Kate Atkinson, Secretary. A committee on credentials was appointed by the chair, consisting of one member from each organization.* During the absence of the committee quite an animated discussion arose as to the admission of delegates. Mrs. Gordon said the greatest possible liberality should be exercised in admitting persons to the right to speak and vote; that all who signed the roll, paid the fee, and expressed themselves in sympathy with the movement, should be admitted. After some discussion, Mrs. Gordon's views prevailed, and the names of those who chose to qualify themselves were enrolled. About 120 delegates were thus chosen from nine suffrage societies in different parts of the State. Many counties were represented in which no organizations had yet been formed. Some rather humorous discussion was had as to whether the president should be called Mrs. Chairman or Mrs. Chairwoman. The venerable Mr. Spear arose and suggested the title be Mrs. President, which was adopted. Mrs. Gordon said she had noticed that when questions were put to the meeting not more than a dozen timid voices could be heard saying "aye," or "no." The ladies must not sit like mummies, but open their mouths and vote audibly. This disinclination to do business in a business-like way, is discreditable. (Cheers). Mrs. Gordon's hint was taken, and unequivocal demonstration of voices was made thereafter upon the taking of each vote. Long before the time arrived for the evening session, the hall in every part, platform, floor and gallery, was crowded, and large numbers were unable to gain entrance.

The Committee on Permanent Organization presented the following names for officers of the convention: President, Mrs. Wallis of Mayfield; Vice-Presidents, J. A. Collins, C. G. Ames, Mrs. Mary W. Coggins; Secretaries, Mrs. McKee, Mrs. Rider, Mrs. Perry; Treasurer, Mrs. Collins. On motion, Mrs. Haskell and Mrs. Ames escorted the president to the rostrum, and introduced her to the convention. Mrs. Wallis is a lady of imposing presence, and very earnest in the movement. Upon being introduced she said:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—I thank you for this expression of your high esteem and confidence in electing me to preside over your deliberations. I regard this as a severe ordeal, but, having already been tested in this respect, I do not fear the trials to come. I shall persevere until the emancipation of women is effected, and in order to fulfill my duties successfully upon this occasion, I ask the hearty coöperation of all. [Applause].

Mrs. Stow gave the opening address, after which delegates † from various localities made interesting reports. An able series of resolutions was presented and dis-

* Rev. C. G. Ames, San Francisco; Mrs. S. S. Allyn, Oakland; Mrs. Sarah Wallis, Mayfield; Mrs. Bowman, Sacramento; Mrs. Georgiana Bruce Kirby, Santa Cruz; Mrs. Fannie Kingsbury, San Diego; Mrs. Elmira Eddy, Nevada; Mrs. A. A. Haskell, Petaluma; Minnie H. McKee, Santa Clara.

† See Appendix to California chapter.

cussed at length by various members of the convention, and letters of sympathy were read from friends throughout the country.*

From the first session, some anxiety was felt regarding the action of the State Society in affiliating with one of the two rival associations in the East. The Rev. C. G. Ames of San Francisco, whose wife had been in attendance upon the Cleveland convention of the American Association, was appointed vice-president for California, while Mrs. E. T. Schenck had been appointed vice-president by the National Association. In addition to the names of officers of county societies appended to the call for this convention, both Mrs. Schenck and Mrs. Ames signed in their official capacity, as vice-president of their respective Associations. Under these circumstances it was not strange that a spirit of rivalry should manifest itself, but it was unfortunate that it was carried so far as to breed disturbance in this infant organization. The leading women looked upon Mrs. E. Cady Stanton and Miss Susan B. Anthony as among the first who organized the suffrage movement in the United States, and therefore felt that it was due to them that our California Society which owed its existence mainly to the efforts of Mrs. Schenck whom they had appointed vice-president for California, should show its loyalty, devotion and gratitude to them, by becoming auxiliary to the National Association. On the other hand, Rev. C. G. Ames, being an enthusiastic admirer of some of the leading spirits in the American Association, desired it to be auxiliary to that. This conflict having been foreshadowed, a letter was written to Miss Anthony in relation to it. Her reply was received by Mrs. Schenck on the first day of the convention, breathing a noble spirit of unselfishness, advising us not to allow any personal feelings towards Mrs. Stanton or herself to influence us in the matter, but rather to keep our association entirely independent, free to coöperate with all societies having for their object the enfranchisement of woman. Accordingly, the following resolution was almost unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That the California Woman Suffrage Society remain independent of all other associations for one year.

The result was satisfactory to Mrs. Schenck and her sympathizers, but Mr. Ames seemed loth to relinquish his preference for the American, and the course taken had the effect of lessening his zeal and that of his followers, until they gradually dropped from the ranks. But the convention, despite the unfortunate schism, was a grand success. The sessions were crowded, and so great was the interest awakened in the public mind that a final adjournment was not had until Saturday night, after four days of earnest, profitable work. The press of the city gave full and fair reports of the proceedings, though very far from endorsing woman's claim to suffrage, and men and women of all classes and

* At the close of the convention a State society was organized, with the following officers: *President*, Mrs. A. A. Haskell of Petaluma; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. J. W. McComb of San Francisco, Mrs. Denio of Solano, Mrs. Kingsbury of San Diego, Mrs. E. J. Hall of Los Angeles, Mrs. Eddy of Nevada, Mrs. Lewis of Sacramento, Mrs. Kirby of Santa Cruz, Mrs. Agnes Eager of Alameda, Mrs. Watkins of Santa Clara, Mrs. L. D. Latimer of Sonoma; *Secretary*, Mrs. Minnie McKee of Santa Clara. *Board of Control*, Mrs. C. H. Spear, Mrs. C. G. Ames, Mrs. Minnie Edwards, Mrs. Celia Curtis, Miss Laura Fowler, Mr. John A. Collins, Miss Kate Atkinson, Mrs. Pitts Stevens.

professions took an active part in the deliberations. But of the multitude who met in that first woman suffrage convention on the Pacific coast but few were prominent in after years.

The newly organized society immediately arranged to send a delegation to Sacramento, to present to the legislature then in session a petition for woman suffrage. The delegation consisted of Laura DeForce Gordon, Caroline H. Spear and Laura Cuppy Smith, who were accorded a hearing before a special committee of the Senate, of which the venerable Judge Tweed, an able advocate of woman suffrage, was chairman. The proceeding was without a parallel in the history of the State. The novelty of women addressing the legislature attracted universal attention, and the newspapers were filled with reports of that important meeting.

During the year 1870 a general agitation was kept up. A number of speakers* held meetings in various parts of the State. The newspapers were constrained to notice this all-absorbing topic, though most of them were opposed to the innovation, and maintained a bitter war against its advocates. Prominent among them was the sensational San Francisco *Chronicle* followed by the *Bulletin*, the *Call*, and in its usual negative style, the *Alta*, while the *Examiner* mildly ridiculed the subject, and a score of lesser journalistic lights throughout the State exhibited open hostility to woman suffrage, or simply mentioned the fact of its agitation as a matter of news. But the brave pioneers in this unpopular movement received kindly sympathy and encouragement from some journals of influence, first among which was the San Francisco *Post*, then under the management of that popular journalist, Harry George, afterwards distinguished as the author of "Progress and Poverty." The San José *Mercury* was our friend from the first, and its fearless and able editor, J. J. Owen, accepted the office of president of the State woman suffrage society to which he was elected in 1878. The Sacramento *Bee* also did valiant service in defending and advocating woman's political equality, its veteran editor, James McClatchy, being a man of liberal views and great breadth of thought, whose powerful pen was wielded in advocacy of justice to all until his death, which occurred in October, 1883. There were several county journals that spoke kind words in our behalf, and occasionally one under the editorial management of a woman would fearlessly advocate political equality.

During the year of 1870, Mrs. Gordon traveled extensively over the State, delivering more than one hundred lectures, beside making an extended tour, in company with Mrs. Pitts Stevens, through Nevada, where on the Fourth of July, at a convention held at Battle Mountain, the first suffrage organization for that State was effected. In February, 1871, Mrs. Gordon again lectured in Nevada, remaining several weeks in Carson while the legislature was in session. She was invited by that body to address them upon the proposed amendment to the State constitution to allow women to vote, which amendment was lost by a majority of only

* Mrs. Kingsbury of San Diego, Mrs. H. F. M. Brown, Addie L. Ballou, Paulina Roberts, Mrs. C. H. Spear, Laura Cuppy Smith, Mrs. F. A. Logan, M. D., Mrs. C. M. Churchill, John A. Collins, and a large number of local speakers, who aided in organizing societies, or in keeping up the interest in those already formed.

Digitized by Google

two votes, obtained by a political trick, the question being voted upon without a call of the House, when several members friendly to the measure were absent. The author of the proposed amendment was the Hon. C. J. Hillier, a prominent lawyer of Virginia City, who, in bringing the bill before the legislature in 1869, delivered one of the ablest arguments ever given in favor of woman suffrage.

In 1871 Mrs. Gordon again made an extended tour through California, Oregon, and Washington Territory, traveling mostly by stage, enduring hardships, braving dangers and everywhere overcoming prejudice and antagonism to strong-minded women, by the persuasiveness of her arguments. In September, while lecturing in Seattle, a telegram informed her of her nomination by the Independent party of San Joaquin county for the office of State senator, requesting her immediate return to California. This necessitated a journey of nearly a thousand miles, one-half by stage-coach. Six days of continuous travel brought her to Stockton, where she entered at once upon the senatorial campaign. Mrs. Gordon spoke every night until election, and succeeded in awakening a lively interest in her own candidacy and in the subject of woman suffrage. Her eligibility to the office was vehemently denied, particularly by Republicans, who were badly frightened at the appearance of this unlooked-for rival. The pulpit, press, and stump speakers alternated in ridiculing the idea of a woman being allowed to take a seat in the Senate, even if elected. The Democratic party, being in the minority, offered but little opposition, and watched with great amusement this unequal contest between the great dominant party on the one side, and the little Spartan band on the other. The contest was as exciting as it was brief, and despite the great odds of money, official power, political superiority, and the perfect machinery of party organization in favor of her opponents, Mrs. Gordon received about 200 votes, besides as many more which were rejected owing to some technical irregularity. Among those who took part in that novel campaign and deserving special mention, was the venerable pioneer familiarly called Uncle Jarvis, who had voted a straight Whig or Republican ticket for fifty years, and who for the first time in his life scratched his ticket and voted for Mrs. Gordon.

In July, 1871, California was favored by a visit from Mrs. Stanton and Miss Anthony, who awakened new interest wherever their logical and eloquent appeals were heard. Their advent was hailed with joy, and they received marked attention from all classes, the clergy not excepted. Every lecture given by them drew out large assemblies of the most influential of the citizens. Indeed, they received a continual ovation during their stay in San Francisco. After Mrs. Stanton returned to New York, Miss Anthony remained and traveled in California, Nevada, Oregon and Washington Territory several months, speaking at conventions held in San Francisco and Sacramento, besides lecturing in all the principal towns, winning for herself great praise, and a deeper respect for the cause she so ably represented. A complimentary banquet was tendered her in San Francisco on the eve of her departure eastward, at which eighty guests, distinguished in art, literature and social life, sat down to a sumptuous collation spread in the Grand Hotel.

Digitized by Google

In the early part of that year, 1871, Hon. A. A. Sargent and wife returned to California from Washington, his term as representative having expired, and both took an active part in the work of woman's political enfranchisement. Mr. Sargent, with commendable bravery, which under the circumstances was indeed a test of courage, delivered an address in favor of woman suffrage at a convention held in San Francisco, just on the eve of an important political campaign, in which he was a candidate for reëlection to congress, and also to the United States Senate. Of course, those opposed to woman suffrage tried to make capital out of it against him, but without avail, for that able and distinguished statesman was elected to both offices, his term as representative expiring before he would be called upon to take his seat in the United States Senate. His noble wife, Ellen Clark Sargent, took an active interest in all the woman suffrage meetings, and in November, 1871, was appointed, as was also Mrs. Gordon, to represent California in the National convention to be held in Washington in January, 1872.

During the session of the California legislature in 1871–2 a delegation from the State Society visited Sacramento and was accorded a hearing in the Assembly-chamber before the Judiciary Committee of that body. Addresses were made by Mrs. Pitts Stevens, Mrs. A. A. Haskell, Mrs. E. A. H. DeWolf and Hon. John A. Collins.

During the session of 1873–4 a bill was passed by the legislature making women eligible to school offices, and also one which provided that all women employed in the public schools should receive the same compensation as men holding the same grade certificates.

Mrs. Laura Morton has filled and ably discharged the office of assistant State librarian for the past ten years. Mrs. Mandeville was deputy-controller during the Democratic administration of Governor Irwin, and proved herself fully capable of discharging the duties of that responsible office; while for several years women have been elected to various positions in the legislature and employed as clerks.

July 10, 1873, the Woman Suffrage Society was incorporated under the laws of the State, with Mrs. Sarah Wallis, president. Mrs. Clara S. Foltz, a brilliant young woman who had begun the study of law in San José, knew the statutes permitted no woman to be admitted to the bar, and early in the session of 1877 drafted a bill amending the code in favor of women, and sent it to Senator Murphy of Santa Clara to be presented. Five years before this, however, Mrs. Nettie Tator had applied for admission to the bar at Santa Cruz. A committee of prominent attorneys appointed by the court examined her qualifications as a lawyer. She passed creditably and was unanimously recommended by the committee, when it was discovered that the law would not admit women to that learned profession.

Following the presentation of Mrs. Foltz' bill, Mrs. Knox Goodrich, Laura Watkins, Mrs. Wallis and Laura De Force Gordon were appointed by the State Society a committee to visit Sacramento during the session and use their influence to secure the passage of the "Woman's Lawyer Bill," as it was termed, and to petition for suffrage. Mrs. Gordon, who

Digitized by Google

was also reading law, was in Sacramento as editorial correspondent for her paper, the *Daily Democrat* of Oakland, and had ample opportunity to render valuable service to the cause she had so much at heart. The bill passed the Senate by a vote of 22 to 9, being ably advocated by Senators N. Green Curtis, Judge Niles Searles of Nevada county, Creed Haymond of Sacramento, and Joseph Craig of Yolo. In the Assembly, after weeks of tedious delay and almost endless debate, the bill was indefinitely postponed by a majority of one. By the persistent efforts of Assemblymen Grove L. Johnson of Sacramento, R. W. Murphy, Charles Gildea and Dr. May of San Francisco, the bill was brought up on reconsideration and passed by two majority. The session was within three days of its close, and so bitter was the opposition to the bill that an effort was made to prevent its engrossment in time to be presented for the governor's signature. The women and their allies, who were on the watch for tricks, defeated the scheme of their enemies and had the bill duly presented to Governor Irwin, but not till the last day of the session. Then the suspense became painful to those most interested lest it might not receive his approval. Mrs. Gordon, as editor of a Democratic journal, asserted her claims to some recognition from that party and strongly urged that a Democratic governor should sign the bill. Aided by a personal appeal from Senator Niles Searles to his excellency, her efforts were crowned with success; the governor's message sent to the Senate, when the hands of the clock pointed to fifteen minutes of twelve, midnight (at which hour the president's gavel would descend with the words adjourning the Senate *sine die*), announced that Senate bill number 66, which permitted the admission of women to all the courts of the State, had received his approval. There was great rejoicing over this victory among the friends everywhere, though the battle was not yet ended.

The same legislature had passed a bill accepting the munificent donation to the State of $100,000 from Judge Hastings to found the Hastings College of Law, on condition that it be the law department of the State University, and the college was duly opened for the admission of students. At the beginning of the December term Mrs. Foltz, who had been admitted to the District Court in San José (being the first woman ever admitted to any court in the State), came to San Francisco, and with Mrs. Gordon applied for admission to the law college. The dean, Judge Hastings, himself opposed to women being received as students, told them it was a matter that must be laid before the board of directors, but that they could attend the lectures *ad interim*. Three days later they were informed that their application had been denied. Satisfied that the law was in their favor, they immediately appealed to the courts. To save time Mrs. Gordon applied to the Supreme Court and Mrs. Foltz to the District Court, simultaneously, for a writ of mandamus to compel the directors to act in obedience to the law which, the petitioners claimed, did not discriminate against women in founding the State University or its departments. The Supreme Court, wishing perhaps to shirk the responsibility of acting in the first instance, sent their petitioner, Mrs. Gordon, to the lower court, which had in the meantime ordered the writ

to issue for Mrs. Foltz; so it was decided to make hers the test-case, and by the courtesy of Judge Morrison, now chief-justice of the Supreme Court, Mrs. Gordon was joined with Mrs. Foltz in the prosecution of the cause. The board of directors of the college consisted of the chief-justice of the Supreme Bench and seven other lawyers, among the most distinguished and able in the State. The case attracted great attention and deep interest was taken in the proceedings. Judges Lake and Cope, who were ex-justices of the Supreme Court, assisted by T. B. Bishop, another learned practitioner at the bar, were arrayed as counsel for the defense against these comparatively young students in the law, who appeared unaided in their own behalf. After one of the most interesting legal contests in the history of the State these women came off victors, and the good-natured public, through the press, offered them congratulations. But the defendants would not yield without a stubborn resistance and carried their cause on appeal to the Supreme Court; hence many months elapsed before the final struggle came, but victory again rewarded the petitioners, the Supreme Court deciding that women *should* be admitted to the law department of the State University. Although excluded from the benefit of the lectures in the college, Mesdames Gordon and Foltz had improved their time in study, and in December, 1879, both were admitted to the Supreme Court of the State, after a thorough examination.

Prior to this legal contest, in the summer of 1878, when delegates to the constitutional convention were to be elected, Mrs. Gordon, urged by her friends in San Joaquin county, became an independent candidate only a week or two before the election. With Mrs. Foltz she made a very brief though brilliant canvass, attracting larger and more enthusiastic audiences than any other speaker. Mrs. Gordon received several hundred votes for the office, and felt compensated for the time and money spent by the great interest awakened in the subject of woman suffrage.

As soon as the constitutional convention assembled in September, Mrs. Gordon, although still pursuing her legal studies, was able as a newspaper correspondent to closely watch the deliberations of that body and urge the insertion of a woman suffrage clause in the new organic law. The State Society delegated Mrs. Knox Goodrich, Mrs. Sarah Wallis and Mrs. Watkins to join Mrs. Gordon in pressing the claims of woman, but the opposition was too strong and the suffrage clause remained declaring male citizens entitled to vote, though a section in the bill of rights, together with other provisions in the new constitution, renders it quite probable that the legislature has the right to enfranchise women without having to amend the organic law. At all events the new instrument is far more favorable to women than the old, as will now be shown. The agitation of the question of the admission of women to the Law College, which began during the session of the convention, led that body to incorporate the following provision in the constitution:

ARTICLE II., SEC. 18. No person shall be debarred admission to any of the collegiate departments of the State University on account of sex.

Remembering the hard struggle by which the right to practice law had been secured to women, and the danger of leaving it to the caprice of

future legislatures, Mrs. Gordon drafted a clause which protects women in all lawful vocations, and by persistent effort succeeded in getting it inserted in the new constitution, as follows:

ARTICLE XX., SEC. 18. No person shall, on account of sex, be disqualified from entering upon or pursuing any lawful business, vocation or profession.

The adoption of this clause, so valuable to women, was mainly accomplished by the skillful diplomacy of Hon. Charles S. Ringgold, delegate from San Francisco, who introduced it in the convention and worked faithfully for its adoption. Thus California stands to-day one of the first States in the Union, as regards the educational, industrial and property rights of women, and the probability of equal political rights being secured to them at an early day, is conceded by the most conservative.

About the time Mrs. Foltz and Mrs. Gordon were admitted to the bar, they, as chief officers of the State W. S. S. (incorporated), called a convention in San Francisco. It convened in February, 1880, and was well attended. Mrs. Sargent took an active part in the meetings, occupied the chair as president *pro tem.*, and subsequently spoke of the work done by the National Association in Washington. Several prominent officials, unable to be present, sent letters heartily endorsing our claims; among these were Governor Perkins, State Senator Chace, and A. M. Crane, judge of the Superior Court. Addresses were delivered by Judge Swift, Marian Todd and Mrs. Thorndyke of Los Angeles, Judge Palmer of Nevada city, and others. The newspapers of the city, though still hostile to the object of the convention, gave very fair reports. In September following, the annual meeting of the society was held, and made particularly interesting by the fact that the proposed new city charter, which contained a clause proscriptive of women, was denounced, and a plan of action agreed upon whereby its defeat should be secured, if possible, at the coming election. The women worked assiduously against the adoption of the city charter, and rejoiced to see it rejected by a large majority.

The following facts in regard to the constitution and statute laws of California were sent us by the Hon. A. A. Sargent:

In 1879, California adopted a new constitution, by means of a constitutional convention. It was an unfortunate time for such organic legislation, for the reason that the State was rife at the time with the agitation of "sand-lotters," as they were called, a violent faction which assailed property rights and demanded extreme concessions to labor. The balance of power in the constitutional convention was held by persons elected by this element, and resulted in a constitution extraordinary in some of its features, but which was adopted by the people after a fierce contest.

Women fared badly at the hands of these constitution-makers, so far as suffrage is concerned. Section 1, article 2, confirms the right of voting to "every native male citizen," and "every male naturalized citizen," although a heroic effort was made by the friends of woman suffrage to keep out the word "male." But section 18, article XX., provides that "no person shall, on account of sex, be disqualified from entering upon or pursuing any lawful business, vocation or profession."

Some years before, the State had adopted a "civil code," which was abreast of the world in liberality to women. This code discarded the idea of any servility in the relation of the wife to the husband. This code is still the law, and provides, in effect, that husband and wife contract toward each other obligations of mutual respect, fidelity and support. The husband is the head of the family, and may choose any

reasonable place and mode of life, and the wife must conform thereto. Neither has any interest in the property of the other, and neither can be excluded from the other's dwelling. Either may enter into any engagement or transaction with the other, or with any other person, respecting property, which either might if unmarried. They may hold property as tenants in common or otherwise, with each other, and with others. All property of the wife owned by her before marriage, and acquired afterwards by gift, devise, bequest or descent, with the rents, issues and profit thereof, is her separate property, and she may convey the same without his consent. All property acquired after marriage is community property. The earnings of the wife are not liable for the debts of the husband. Her earnings, and those of minor children in her custody, are her separate property. A married woman may dispose of her separate property by will, without the consent of her husband, as if she were single. One-half of the community property goes absolutely to the wife, on the death of the husband, and cannot be diverted by his testamentary disposition. A married woman can carry on business in her own name, on complying with certain formalities, and her stock, capital and earnings are not liable to her husband's creditors, or his intermeddling. The husband and father, as such, has no rights superior to those of the wife and mother, in regard to the care, custody, education and control of the children of their marriage, while such husband and wife live separate and apart from each other.

The foregoing exhibits the spirit of the California law. It is believed by friends of woman suffrage that had the convention been held under normal conditions, the word "male" might have been eliminated from that instrument.

Several creditable attempts were early made in journalism. In 1855 Mrs. S. M. Clark published the weekly *Contra Costa* in Oakland. In 1858, *The Hesperian*, a semi-monthly magazine, was issued in San Francisco, Mrs. Hermione Day and Mrs. A. M. Shultz, editors. It was quite an able periodical,* and finally passed into the hands of Elizabeth T. Schenck.

As journalists and printers, women have met with encouraging success. The most prominent among them is Laura DeForce Gordon, who began the publication of the *Daily Leader* at Stockton in 1873, continued afterward at Oakland as the *Daily Democrat*, until 1878. In Geo. P. Rowell's *Newspaper Reporter* for 1874, the *Stockton Leader* is announced as "the only daily newspaper in the world edited and published by a woman." Mrs. Boyer, known as "Dora Darmoor," published different magazines and journals in San Francisco during a period of several years, the most successful being the *Golden Dawn*. Mrs. Theresa Corlett has been connected with various leading journals of San Francisco, and is well known as a brilliant and interesting writer. Miss Madge Morris has not only made a place for herself in light literature, but has been acting-clerk in the legislature for several sessions. Mrs. Sarah M. Clark published a volume entitled "Teachings of the Ages"; Mrs. Josephine Wolcott, a volume of poems, called "The World of Song."

Mrs. Amanda Slocum Reed, one of our most efficient advocates of suffrage, has proved her executive ability, and capacity for business, by the management of a large printing and publishing establishment for several years. The liberal magazine called *Common Sense*, was published by her and her husband—most of its original contents the product of her pen;

* Chief among its contributors were Eliza W. Farnham, Sarah M. Clark, Amanda Simonton Page, Mrs. M. D. Strong, Fanny Green, Annie K. Fader, Eliza A. Pittsinger, Mrs. James Neal, Mrs. Elizabeth Williams.

and when the radicalism of her husband caused the suspension of that journal in 1878, Mrs. Slocum began the publication of *Roll Call*, a temperance magazine which was mainly edited by her gifted little daughter Clara, only fifteen years old, who also set all the type. Among the earliest printers of California was Lyle Lester. She established a printing office in San Francisco in 1860, in which she employed a large number of girls and women as compositors. Miss Delia Murphy—now Mrs. Dearing—ranks with the best printers in San Francisco, and several women in various portions of the State have taken like standing. "Mrs. Richmond & Son," is the novel sign which decorates the front of a large printing establishment on Montgomery street, San Francisco, known for many years as the "Woman's Coöperative Printing Company," but which, in fact, was always an individual enterprise. Mrs. Augusta DeForce Cluff has entered upon her seventh year in practical journalism as publisher of a sprightly weekly, the *Valley Review*, at Lodi, in which enterprise she has met with remarkable success, being a superior business manager as well as a facile and talented writer. Some of her little poems have great merit. Mrs. Cluff and Mrs. Gordon have both filled official positions in the Pacific Coast Press Association. Miss Mary Bogardus, the gifted young daughter of that pioneer journalist, H. B. Bogardus, editor of *Figaro*, is her father's main assistant in all the business of his office. Mrs. Wittingham has been elected postmaster of the State Senate several terms, and is at present employed in the U. S. branch mint in San Francisco.

One of the most meritorious and successful enterprises occupying the attention of the women of California, is the silk culture, which promises to develop into one of the dominant industries of the nation. Mrs. G. H. Hittel first brought the subject into public notice by able articles on the cultivation of the mulberry tree, published in various journals. In 1880 she formed the Ladies' Silk Culture Society of California. This association like its predecessor, the first Woman Suffrage Society, was organized and held its meetings in private parlors for a time, but it soon required more room. Men have been taken into membership since the object for which the society was formed seemed to be feasible, and, as a natural result, whatever of financial and honorary reward may be accorded the self-sacrificing women who performed the arduous and thankless labor of founding the institution, will be shared with the men who now come into the work.

During the session of the legislature of 1883, a committee was appointed to ask an appropriation from the State for the purpose of establishing a Filature or free silk-reeling school. After considerable delay the committee called to their aid Mrs. Gordon, and asked her to visit the State capital and see what could be done. The session was rapidly drawing to a close, and even the warmest friends of the measure feared that it was too late to accomplish anything. But happily the bill was got through both branches of the legislature and sent to the governor the last hour of the session. By its provisions a State Board of Silk Culture was created consisting of nine members, five of whom were to be women,

and the sum of $7,500 was appropriated. Thus women have begun and are now fostering a great industrial enterprise which in the near future will give to millions of hitherto unemployed or ill-paid women and children an occupation peculiarly suited to them, and which will add millions of dollars annually to the revenue of the country. Mrs. Florence Kimball of San Diego county was appointed a member of the State Board of Silk Commissioners by Governor Stoneman in 1883.

Since the expiration of their term as superintendents of the public schools of the State, Dr. and Mrs. James Carr have made their home in that loveliest spot of southern California—Passadena, where, overlooking rich orange groves and luxurious vineyards, they enjoy the blessings of prosperity, and where Mrs. Carr, with her ambitious, active nature, finds congenial employment in demonstrating what woman can accomplish in silk-culture, raisin-making, and the crystalizing of fruit.

Miss Austen, formerly a teacher in the public schools of San Francisco, has a vineyard at Fresno, where she employs women and girls to prepare all her considerable crop of raisins for market, conceded to be of the best quality produced in the State. Mrs. Ellen McConnell Wilson of Sacramento county, from the small beginning, twenty years ago, of 320 acres of land, and less than 1,000 sheep, has now over 5,000 acres of rich farming land and 6,000 sheep. Mrs. H. P. Gregory of Sacramento, left a widow with a large family of little children, succeeded her husband in the shipping and commission business in which he was engaged on a small scale. From such a beginning, Mrs. Gregory has built up one of the largest trades in that city, and has by judicious investments in real estate acquired property of a value exceeding $100,000, besides having reared and educated her numerous family.

Mrs. Elizabeth Hill was one of the early settlers in Calaveras county, where her husband located land on the Mokelumne river near Camanche in 1855. Six years after she was left a widow with four little children. The support of the family devolved upon the mother, and she engaged in cultivating the land, adding thereto several hundred acres. In 1877 Mrs. Hill began the cultivation of the Persian-insect-powder plant, known to commerce as Buhach. So successful has this venture proved that she has now over 200 acres planted to that shrub, and manufactures each year about fifteen tons of the Buhach powder, for which she finds a ready sale. The number of women who have supported their families (often including the husband), and acquired a competency in boarding and lodging-house keeping, dressmaking, millinery, type-setting, painting, fancy work, stock-dealing, and even in manufacturing and mercantile pursuits, is legion.

In regard to the position of women in medicine, Miss Elizabeth Sargent, M. D., writes:

Women are admitted on equal terms with men to the medical and dental departments of the State University, and to the Cooper Medical College of San Francisco. Women are also eligible to membership in the State and various county medical associations, as well as in the dental association. There are in the State 73 women who have been recognized by the authorities as qualified to practice. They may be classified as follows: Practitioners of regular medicine, 30, 16 of whom are established in San Francisco; eclectics, 22, 9 in San Francisco; homœopathists, 21, 2 in San Fran-

Digitized by Google

cisco. Among these physicians two make a specialty of the eye and ear, one in San Francisco and one in San José. Two women have been graduated from the State Dental College, located in San Francisco. In April, 1875, the Pacific Dispensary Hospital for women and children was founded by women. In 1881 a training-school for nurses was added. The hospital department, although admitting women, is intended especially for children, and is the only children's hospital on the coast. The dispensary is for out-patients, both women and children. The board of ten directors, the resident and attending physicians of the hospital, and five out of the seven connected with the dispensary are women. From a small beginning the institution has increased to importance, and bids fair to continue in its present prosperity and capacity for good work. I have written thus lengthily that you may see how energetic our women have been in originating and carrying on such an institution.

The most prominent literary woman of the coast is undoubtedly Miss M. W. Shinn. She is a graduate of our State University and was the medal scholar of her class. At present she is the editor of the *Overland Monthly*, and the excellent prospects of the magazine are largely the result of her own courage and the hard work she has done.

The higher education in the State is being put upon a secure basis. Hon. Leland Stanford and his wife, Jane Lathrop Stanford, have recently given a great part of their vast fortune for the establishment of a university which bids fair to be the foremost educational institution on the continent. In a letter specifying his views in regard to the management of the university, Governor Stanford says:

> We deem it of the first importance that the education of both sexes shall be equally full and complete, varied only as nature dictates. The rights of one sex, political and other, are the same as those of the other sex, and this equality of rights ought to be fully recognized.

There are many men and women throughout the State who have faithfully advocated political equality for all citizens.*

Mendocino county has the honor of claiming as a citizen, one of the earliest and ablest women in this reform, Clarina Howard Nichols, who may be said to have sown the seeds of liberty in three States in which she has resided, Vermont, Kansas and California. Since 1870, her home has been with a son in Pomo, where she finished her heroic life January 11, 1885. Though always in rather straitened circumstances, Mrs. Nichols was uniformly calm and cheerful, living in an atmosphere above the petty annoyances of every-day life with the great souls of our day and generation, keeping time in the march of progress. She was too much absorbed in the vital questions of the hour even to take note of her personal discomforts. Many of her able articles published in magazines and the journals of the day, and letters from year to year to our

---

* Among the many who have been active and faithful in the movement for the political rights of women, whose names should be mentioned, are: Mrs. Eliza Taylor, Mrs. O. Fuller, Elizabeth McComb, Dr. Laura P. Williams, Mrs. Dr. White, Sallie Hart, Dr. R. H. McDonald, Hon. Frank Pixley, and many others in *San Francisco;* Fanny Green McDougal, *Oakland;* Mrs. Phebe Benedict, *Antioch;* Mrs. Isabella Irwin, *San Rafael;* Mrs. Cynthia Palmer, Mrs. Emily Rolfe, *Nevada City;* Mrs. Elizabeth Condy, *Stockton;* Miss E. S. Sleeper, *Mountain View;* Mrs. Laura J. Watkins, Mrs. Damon, *Santa Clara;* Mrs. Dr. Kilpatrick, *San Mateo;* Mrs. S. G. Waterhouse, Drs. Kellogg and Bearby, Mrs. M. J. Young, Mrs. E. B. Crocker, and others, *Sacramento;* Mrs. Mary Jewett, Mr. and Mrs. Howell, *Healdsburgh;* Mrs. Lattimer, *Windsor;* Mr. and Mrs. Denio, Mrs. E. L. Hale, *Vallejo;* Mrs. J. Lewellyn, Mrs. Potter, *St. Helena;* Mr. and Mrs. J. Eggleston, *Napa;* Henry and Abigail Bush, *Martinez;* Rowena Granice Steele, *Merced;* Mrs. Jennie Phelps Purvis, Mrs. Lapham and daughter, *Modesto.*

conventions, were written in such conditions of weakness and suffering, as only a hero could have overcome. She was a good writer, an effective speaker, and a preëminently brave woman, gifted with that rarest of all virtues, common sense.

The advocacy of woman's rights began in Santa Cruz county, with the advent of that grand champion of her sex, the immortal Eliza Farnham, who braved public scorn and contumely because of her advanced views, for many years before the suffrage movement assumed organized form. Mrs. Farnham's work rendered it possible for those advocating woman suffrage years later, to do so with comparative immunity from public ridicule. A society was organized there in 1869, and Rev. D. G. Ingraham, E. B. Heacock, H. M. Blackburn, Mrs. Georgiana Bruce Kirby, Mrs. Van-Valkenburgh, W. W. Broughton and wife, and Mrs. Jewell were active members.

Prominent in Santa Clara county is Mrs. Sarah Wallis of Mayfield. From the first agitation of the subject in 1868, when she entered heartily into the work of getting subscribers to *The Revolution*, she has been untiring in her efforts to advance the interests of women. A lady of fine presence, great energy and perseverance, Mrs. Wallis has been able to accomplish great good for her sex. With a large separate estate, when the statutes prevented her as a married woman from managing it, she determined that the laws should be changed, and never ceased her efforts until she succeeded in getting an amendment to the civil code which enables married women to make contracts. The most successful suffrage meetings ever held in Santa Clara county have been at Mayfield. There Mrs. Wallis and her husband, Judge Joseph S. Wallace, make their spacious and luxurious home the rendezvous of lecturers and writers in the great work of woman's emancipation.

Mrs. Sarah Knox Goodrich of San José, was among the first to see the significance of the movement for woman's rights in 1868. Her husband, William J. Knox, who shortly before his death had been State senator, secured the passage of a bill, drafted by himself, giving to married women the right to dispose of their own separate property by will. Having been from her youth the cherished companion of a man who believed in the equality of the sexes, and being herself a thoughtful, clear-headed person, she naturally took her place with those whose aim was the social and political emancipation of woman, and has stood from the first a tower of strength in this cause, giving largely of her wealth for the propagation of its doctines. Mrs. Knox Goodrich has for many years paid her taxes, sometimes exorbitant, under protest, and at important elections has also offered her vote, to have it refused. The county suffrage society has had an untiring leader in Mrs. Goodrich, and on all occasions she has nerved the weak and encouraged the timid by her example of unflinching devotion. The following extracts from a letter written by the lady will show how effective her work has been:

In 1872, our society was invited to take part in the Fourth of July celebration, which we did, and had the handsomest carriages and more of them than any other society in the procession. We paid our own expenses, although the city had

made an appropriation for the celebration. In 1876 we were not invited to take part in the festivities, but some of us felt that on such a day, our centennial anniversary, we should not be ignored. Accordingly I started out to see what could be done, but finding some of our most active friends ill and others absent from home, I decided to do what I could alone. I had mottoes from the grand declarations of the Fathers painted and put on my house, which the procession would pass on two sides.

Some of our most prominent ladies seeing that I was determined to make a manifestation, drove with me in the procession, our carriage and horses decorated with flags, the ladies wearing sashes of red, white and blue, and bearing banners with mottoes and evergreens. A little daughter of Mrs. Clara Foltz, the lawyer, dressed in red, white and blue, was seated in the center of the carriage, carrying a white banner with silver fringe, a small flag at the top with a silver star above that, with streamers of red, white and blue floating from it, and in the center, in letters large enough to be seen some distance, the one word "Hope." On my flag the motto was: "We are Taxed without being Represented"; Mrs. Maria H. Weldon's, "We are the disfranchised Class"; Mrs. Marion Hooker's, "The Class entitled to respectful Consideration"; and Miss Hannah Millard's, "We are governed without our Consent." On the front of my house in large letters was the motto: "Taxation without Representation is Tyranny as much in 1876, as it was in 1776"; on the other side was, "We are Denied the Ballot, but Compelled to Pay Taxes"; fronting the other side was, "Governments Derive their Just Powers from the Consent of the Governed." Mrs. McKee also had the last motto on her house. On the evening of July 3, after we had all our preparations completed, we sent to one of the marshals and asked him to give us a place in the procession *next to the negroes*, as we wished to let our legal protectors have a practical illustration of the position occupied by their mothers, wives, sisters and daughters in this boasted republic. We *did* want to go in, however, *ahead of the Chinamen*, as we considered our position at present to be between the two. The marshal willingly assigned us a place, but not the one we desired. "We cannot allow you," said he, "to occupy such a position. You must go in front, next to the Pioneer Association"; and being in part members of that society we accepted the decision. Our carriage was the center of attraction. Many, after reading our mottoes, said: "Well, ladies, we will help you to get your rights"; "It is a shame for you to be taxed and not have the right to vote." Hundreds of people stood and read the mottoes on the house, making their comments, both grave and gay: "Good for Mrs. Knox"; "She is right"; "If I were in her place I would never pay a tax"; "I guess one of the strong-minded lives here."

Mrs. Knox was married to Mr. Goodrich, the well-known architect, in 1878, in whom she has found a grand, noble-souled companion, fully in sympathy with all her progressive views, and with whom she is passing the advancing years of her well-spent life in luxury and unalloyed happiness.

Mrs. Van Valkenburg tried to vote under the claim that the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States entitled her to registration, and being refused, brought suit against the registrars. The case was decided against her after being carried to the Supreme Court of California. These cases argued in the Supreme Court have been of inestimable value in the progress of the movement, lifting the question of woman's rights as a citizen above the mists of ridicule and prejudice, into the region of reason and constitutional law. We cannot too highly appreciate the bravery and persistence of the few women who have furnished these test cases and compelled the highest courts to record their decisions.

CHAPTER LIV.

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST.

The Long Marches Westward—Abigail Scott Duniway—Mary Olney Brown—The First Steps in Oregon—Col. C. A. Reed—Judge G. W. Lawson—1870—The New Northwest, 1871—Campaign, Mrs. Duniway and Miss Anthony—They Address the Legislature in Washington Territory—Hon. Elwood Evans—Suffrage Society Organized at Olympia and at Portland—Before the Oregon Legislature—Donation Land Act—Hon. Samuel Corwin's Suffrage Bill—Married Woman's *Sole* Traders' Bill—Temperance Alliance—Women Rejected—Major Williams Fights their Battles and Triumphs—Mrs. H. A. Loughary—Progressive Legislation, 1874—Mob-Law in Jacksonville, 1879—Dr. Mary A. Thompson—Constitutional Convention, 1878—Woman Suffrage Bill, 1880—Hon. W. C. Fulton—Women Enfranchised in Washington Territory, Nov. 15, 1883—Great Rejoicing, Bonfires, Ratification Meetings—Constitutional Amendment Submitted in Oregon and Lost, June, 1884—Suffrage by Legislative Enactment Lost—Fourth of July Celebrated at Vancouvers—Benjamin and Mary Olney Brown—Washington Territory—Legislation in 1867–68 Favorable to Women—Mrs. Brown Attempts to Vote and is Refused—Charlotte Olney French—Women Vote at Grand Mound and Black River Precincts, 1870—Retrogressive Legislation, 1871—Abby H. Stuart in Land-Office—Hon. William H. White—Idaho and Montana.

IN the spring of 1852, when the great *furor* for going West was at its height, in the long trails of miners, merchants and farmers wending their way in ox-carts and canvas-covered wagons over the vast plains, mountains and rivers, two remarkable women, then in the flush of youth, might have been seen; one, Abigail Scott Duniway, destined to leave an indelible mark on the civilization of Oregon, and the other, Mary Olney Brown, on that of Washington territory. What ideas were revolving in these young minds in that long journey of 3,000 miles, six months in duration, it would be difficult to imagine, but the love of liberty had been infused in their dreams somewhere, either in their eastern homes from the tragic scenes of the anti-slavery conflict, or on that perilous march amidst those eternal solitudes by day and the solemn stillness of the far-off stars in the gathering darkness. That this long communion with great nature left its impress on their young hearts and sanctified their lives to the best interests of humanity at large, is clearly seen in the deeply interesting accounts they give of their endeavors to mould the

Digitized by Google

governments of their respective territories on republican principles. Writing of herself and her labors, Mrs. Duniway says:

I was born in Pleasant Grove, Tazewell county, Illinois, October 22, 1834, of the traditional "poor but respectable parentage" which has honored the advent of many a more illustrious worker than myself. Brought up on a farm and familiar from my earliest years with the avocations of rural life, spending the early spring-times in the maple-sugar camp, the later weeks in gardening and gathering stove-wood, the summers in picking and spinning wool, and the autumns in drying apples, I found little opportunity, and that only in winter, for books or play. My father was a generous-hearted, impulsive, talented, but uneducated man; my mother was a conscientious, self-sacrificing, intelligent, but uneducated woman. Both were devotedly religious, and both believed implicitly that self-abnegation was the crowing glory of womanhood. Before I was seventeen I was employed as a district school teacher, received a first-class certificate and taught with success, though how I became possessed of the necessary qualifications I to this day know not. I never did, could, or would study when at school.

In the spring of 1852 my father decided to emigrate to Oregon. My invalid mother expostulated in vain; she and nine of us children were stowed away in ox-wagons, where for six months we made our home, cooking food and washing dishes around camp-fires, sleeping at night in the wagons, and crossing many streams upon wagon-beds, rigged as ferry-boats. When our weary line of march had reached the Black Hills of Wyoming my mother became a victim to the dreadful epidemic, cholera, that devastated the emigrant trains in that never-to-be-forgotten year, and after a few hours' illness her weary spirit was called to the skies. We made her a grave in the solitudes of the eternal hills, and again took up our line of march, "too sad to talk, too dumb to pray." But ten weeks after, our Willie, the baby, was buried in the sands of the Burnt River mountains. Reaching Oregon in the fall with our broken household, consisting of my father and eight motherless children, I engaged in school-teaching till the following August, when I allowed the name of "Scott" to become "Duniway." Then for twenty years I devoted myself, soul and body, to the cares, toils, loves and hopes of a conscientious wife and mother. Five sons and one daughter have been born to us, all of whom are living and at home, engaged with their parents in harmonious efforts for the enfranchisement of women.

The first woman suffrage society ever formed in Oregon, was organized in Salem, the capital of the State, in the autumn of 1870, and consisted of about a dozen members. Col. C. A. Reed was chosen president and G. W. Lawson, secretary. This little society which maintained a quiescent existence for a year or more and then disbanded without ceremony, was, in part, the basis of all subsequent work of its character in Oregon. In the winter of 1871 this society honored me with credentials to a seat in the woman suffrage convention which was to meet in San Francisco the following May. My business called me to the Golden City before the time for the convention, and a telegraphic summons com-

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1934 L

Yours for Liberty,
Abigail Scott Duniway.

Digitized by Google

ceeded to Victoria, a border city belonging to a woman's go[illegible] [illegible], where we found that the idea of the ballot for wo[illegible] was even more unpopu[illegible]

pelled me to return to Oregon without meeting with the California Association in an official way, as I had hoped. But my credentials introduced me to the San Francisco leaders, among whom Emily Pitts Stevens occupied a prominent position as editor and publisher of the *The Pioneer*, the first woman suffrage paper that appeared on the Pacific coast. Before returning to Oregon I resolved to purchase an outfit and begin the publication of a newspaper myself, as I felt that the time had come for vigorous work in my own State, and we had no journal in which the demands of women for added rights were treated with respectful consideration.

Soon after reaching my home in Albany I sold my millinery store and removed to Portland, where, on May 5, 1871, the *New Northwest* made its appearance, and a seige of the citadels of a one-sexed government began, which at this writing is going on with unabated persistency. The first issue of this journal was greeted by storms of ridicule. Everybody prophesied its early death, and my personal friends regarded the enterprise with sincere pity, believing it would speedily end in financial disaster. But the paper, in spite of opposition and burlesque, has grown and prospered.

In August, 1871, Susan B. Anthony favored Oregon and Washington territory with a visit. The fame of this veteran leader had preceded her, and she commanded a wide hearing. We traveled together over the country, visiting inland villages as well as larger towns, holding woman suffrage meetings and getting many subscribers for the *New Northwest*. During these journeyings I became quite thoroughly initiated into the movement and made my first efforts at public speaking. After a six weeks' campaign in Oregon, we went to Olympia, the capital of Washington territory, where the legislature was in session, and where, through a motion of Hon. Elwood Evans, we were invited to address the Assembly in advocacy of equal rights for all the people. From Olympia we proceeded to Victoria, a border city belonging to a woman's government, where we found that the idea of the ballot for woman was even more unpopular than in the United States, though all, by strange inconsistency, were intensely loyal to their queen. After an interesting and profitable experience in the British possessions we returned to Puget Sound, stopping over on our route at the different milling towns that teem with busy life upon the evergreen shores of this Mediterranean of the Pacific. At Seattle we organized an association* in which many of the leading ladies and gentlemen took a prominent part; after which we returned to Olympia, where a territorial organization was effected.†

Returning to Portland, we called a convention, and organized the Oregon State Woman Suffrage Association, with Harriet W. Williams, a venerated octogenarian, president. This estimable woman had been one of the earliest leaders of the woman suffrage movement in the State

* Hon. H. L. Yesler, the city's founder and mayor; Mrs. Yesler, Rev. John F. Damon, Mrs. Mary Olney Brown, Rev. Daniel Bagley and others.

† Its leaders being Mrs. Abbie H. H. Stuart, Mrs. P. C. Hale, Hon. Marshall Blinn, Hon. Elwood Evans, and Mr. J. M. Murphy, editor of the *Washington Standard*.

Digitized by Google

of New York, and her presence at the head of our meetings in Oregon was a source of genuine satisfaction to the friends of the cause in the new State of her adoption. Subsequently, Mrs. Williams was compelled to resign on account of increasing infirmities, but her wise counsels are still cherished by her successors, whom she regards with motherly solicitude as she serenely awaits the final summons of the unseen messenger. Many of those who early distinguished themselves in this connection deserve special mention because of their long-continued zeal in the work.* If others failed us, these were always ready to work the hardest when the fight was hottest. And whatever might be our differences of opinion personally, we have always presented an unbroken phalanx to the foe. The original society at Salem having disbanded, its members joined the new State Association organized at Portland, which has ever since been regarded as the nucleus of all our activities.

In September of 1872, I visited the Oregon legislature, where I went clothed by our association with discretionary power to do what I could to secure special legislation for the women of the State, who, with few exceptions, were at that time entirely under the dominion of the old common law. The exceptions were those fortunate women who, having come to Oregon as early as 1850 and '52, had, by virtue of a United States law, known as the Oregon Donation Land Act, become possessed of "claims," as they were called, on equal shares with their husbands, their half, or halves, of the original ground being set apart as their separate property in realty and *fee simple*. This Donation Land Act deserves especial mention, it being the first law enacted in the United States which recognized the individual personality of a married woman. It became a temporary law of congress in 1850, mainly through the efforts of Hon. Samuel R. Thurston, delegate from Oregon territory (which at that time included the whole of Washington territory), aided by the eminent Dr. Linn of Missouri, from whom one of the principal counties of the State of Oregon derives its name.

My first experience in the capitol was particularly trying. I spent two days among my acquaintances in Salem in a vain attempt to find a woman who was ready or willing to accompany me to the state-house. All were anxious that I should go, but each was afraid to offend her husband, or make herself conspicuous, by going herself. Finally, when I had despaired of securing company, and had nerved myself to go alone, Mary P. Sawtelle, who afterwards became a physician, and now resides in San Francisco where she has a lucrative practice, volunteered to stand by me, and together we entered the dominion hitherto considered sacred to the aristocracy of sex, and took seats in the lobby, our hearts beating audibly. Hon. Joseph Engle, perceiving the innovation and knowing me personally, at once arose, and, after a complimentary speech in which he was pleased to recognize my position as a jonrnalist, moved that I be invited to a seat within the bar and provided with table and stationery as were other members of the profession. The motion carried, with only two

* Mr. D. W. Williams, Mr. and Mrs. W. T. Shanahan, Mr. and Mrs. A. B. Gibson, Rev. T. L. Eliot, Mr. B. C. Duniway, Dr. Mary A. Thompson, Rev. Isaac Dillon and Hon. and Mrs. G. W. Brown.

Digitized by Google

or three dissenting votes; and the way was open from that time forward for women to compete with men on equal terms for all minor positions in both branches of the legislature—a privilege they have not been slow to avail themselves of, scores of them thronging the capitol in these later years, and holding valuable clerkships, many of them sneering the while at the efforts of those who opened the way for them to be there at all.

Hon. Samuel Corwin introduced a woman suffrage bill in the House of Representatives early in the session; and while it was pending, I was invited to make an appeal in its behalf, of which I remember very little, so frightened and astonished was I, except that once I inadvertently alluded to a gentleman by his name instead of his county, whereupon, being called to order, I blushed and begged pardon, but put myself at ease by informing the gentlemen that in all the bygone years while they had been studying parliamentary rules, I had been rocking the cradle.

One member who had made a vehement speech against the bill, in which he had declared that no respectable woman in his county desired the elective franchise, became particularly incensed, as was natural, upon my exhibiting a woman suffrage petition signed by the women he had misrepresented, and headed, *mirabile dictu*, by the name of his own wife! The so-called representative of women lost his temper, and gave vent to some inelegant expletives, for which he was promptly reprimanded by the chair. This offender has since been many times a candidate for office, but the ladies of his district have always secured his defeat. The woman suffrage bill received an unexpectedly large vote at this session, and was favored in 1874 by a still larger one, when it was ably championed by Hon. C. A. Reed, the before named ex-president of the first woman suffrage society in the State.

In 1872 the Senate, the House concurring, passed a Married Woman's Sole Trader bill, under the able leadership of Hon. J. N. Dolph, who has since distinguished himself as our champion in the Senate of the United States. This bill has ever since enabled any woman engaged in business on her own account to register the fact in the office of the county clerk, and thereby secure her tools, furniture, or stock in trade against the liability of seizure by her husband's creditors.

Perhaps I cannot better illustrate the general feeling of opposition to women having a place in public affairs at that time, than by describing the scenes in the State Temperance Alliance in February of that year, when somebody placed my name in nomination as chairman of an important committee. The presiding officer was seized with a sudden deafness when the nomination was made, and the Alliance was convulsed with merriment. Ladies on all sides buzzed about me, and urged me to resent the insult in the name of womanhood. And, as none of them were at that time public speakers, I felt obliged to rise and speak for myself.

"Mr. President," I exclaimed, "by what right do you refuse to recognize women when their names are called? Are men the only lawful members of this Alliance? And if so, is it not better for the women delegates to go home?"

"Mr. President: The committees are now full!" shouted an excited

voter. Somebody, doubtless in ridicule, then nominated me as vice-president-at-large, which was carried amid uproarious merriment. I took my seat, half frightened and wholly indignant; and the deliberations of the sovereign voters were undisturbed for several hours thereafter by word or sign from women. At last they got to discussing a bill for a prohibitory liquor law, and the heat of debate ran high. During the excitement somebody carried a note to the presiding officer, who read it, smiled, colored, and rising, said: "We are hearing nothing from the ladies, and yet they constitute a large majority of this Alliance. Mrs. Duniway, will you not favor us with a speech?"

I was taken wholly by surprise, but sprang to my feet and said: "Mr. President: I have always wondered what it was that consumed so much time in men's conventions. I hope gentlemen will pardon the criticism, but you talk too much, and too many of you try to talk at once. My head is aching from the roar and din of your noisy orators. Gentlemen, what does it all amount to? You are talking about prohibition, but you overestimate your political strength. Disastrous failures attend upon all your endeavors to conquer existing evils by the votes of men alone. Give women the legal power to combat intemperance, and they will soon be able to prove that they do not like drunken husbands any better than men like drunken wives. Make women *free*. Give them the power the ballot gives to you, and the control of their own earnings which rightfully belong to them, and every woman will be able to settle this prohibition business in her own home and on her own account. Men will not tolerate drunkenness in their wives; and women will not tolerate it in husbands unless compelled to."

A prominent clergyman arose, and said: "Mr. President: I charge the sins of the world upon the mothers of men. There are twenty thousand fallen women in New York—two millions of them in America. We cannot afford to let this element vote." Before I was aware of what I was doing I was on my feet again. Shaking my finger at the clergymen, I exclaimed: "How *dare* you make such charges against the mothers of men? You tell us of two millions of fallen women who, you say, would vote for drunkenness; but what say you, sir, to the twenty millions of fallen men—all voters—whose patronage alone enables fallen women to live? Would you disfranchise them, sir? I pronounce your charge a libel upon womanhood, and I know that if we were voters you would not *dare* to utter it."

A gentleman from Michigan—Mr. Curtis—called me to order, saying my remarks were personal. "You, sir, sat still and didn't call this man to order while he stood up and insulted all womanhood!" I exclaimed, vehemently. "Prohibition is the question before the house," said the gentleman, "and the lady should confine herself to the resolution." "That is what I am doing, sir. I am talking about prohibition, and the only way possible to make it succeed."

The chair sustained me amid cries of "good!" "good!" but I had become too thoroughly self-conscious by this time to be able to say anything further, and, with a bow to the chairman whom I had before forgotten to address, I tremblingly took my seat.

A resolution was passed, after a long and stormy debate, declaring it the duty of the legislature to empower women to vote on all questions connected with the liquor traffic; and I, as its author, was chosen a committee to present the same for consideration at the coming legislative session. Woman suffrage gained a new impetus all over the Northwest through this victory. Everybody congratulated its advocates, and the good minister who had unwittingly caused the commotion seized the first opportunity to explain that he had always been an advocate of the cause. I was by this time so thoroughly advertised by the abuse of the press that I had no difficulty in securing large audiences in all parts of the Pacific Northwest.

I was chosen in April, 1872, as delegate to the annual meeting of the National Association, held in New York the following month. Horace Greeley received the nomination for the presidency at the Cincinnati Liberal Republican Convention while I was on the way; and when I reached New York I at first threw what influence I had in the Association in favor of the great editor. But Miss Anthony, who knew Mr. Greeley better than I did, caused me to be appointed chairman of a committee to interview the reputed statesman and officially report the result at the evening session. Miss Anthony and Mrs. Jane Graham Jones of Chicago were the other members of this committee. We obtained the desired interview, of which it only needs to be said that it became my humiliating duty to ask pardon in the evening for the speech in advocacy of the illustrious candidate which in my ignorance I had made in the morning. That Mr. Greeley owed his defeat in part to the opposition of women in that memorable campaign, I have never doubted. But he builded better than he knew in earlier years, for he planted many a tree of liberty that shall live through the ages to come, overshadowing in a measure his failure to recognize the divine right of political equality for woman in his later days.

The first annual convention of the Oregon State Association met in Portland, February 9, 1873. Many ladies and several gentlemen* of more or less local prominence assisted at this convention, but we were able to prevail upon but one gentleman, Col. C. A. Reed of Salem, to occupy the platform with us. This convention received favorable notice from the respectable press of the State, and was largely attended by the best elements of the city and country. Delegates were chosen to attend the forthcoming State Temperance Alliance which held its second annual meeting February 20, and to which a dozen of us went bearing credentials. It was evident from the first that trouble was brewing. The enemy had had a whole year to prepare an ambuscade of which our party had no suspicion. A Committee on Credentials was appointed with instructions to rule the woman suffrage delegation out of the Alliance as a "disturbing element." Hon J. Quinn Thornton was chairman of that

* Addresses were made in advocacy of the cause by Col. Reed, Mrs. J. Devore Johnson, Miss V. M. Olds, Rev. T. L. Eliot, Mrs. C. A. Coburn, Mrs. Beatty (colored), and the writer. The celebrated McGibeney family furnished the music, and the Portland press gave favorable reports of the proceedings. Valuable aid was also contributed by Mr. and Mrs. D. H. Hendee, Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Peters, and Mrs. M. J. Foster.

Digitized by Google

committee. In his report he declared all delegations to be satisfactory (including those from the penitentiary) except the women whom he styled "setting hens," "belligerent females," etc., after which he subsided with pompous gravity. All eyes were turned upon me, and I felt as I fancy a general must when the success or failure of an army in battle depends upon his word. "Mr. President," I exclaimed, as soon as I could get the floor, "I move to so amend the report of the committee as to admit the suffrage delegation." The motion was seconded by a half-dozen voices. Then followed a scene which beggars description. It was pandemonium broken loose. When I arose again to address the chair that worthy ordered my arrest by the sergeant-at-arms, saying: "Take that crazy woman out of the house and take care of her." The officer came forward in discharge of his duty, but he quailed before my uplifted pencil, and several gentlemen stepped into the aisle and began drawing off their coats to defend me, among them a veteran minister of the gospel. I smiled and bowed my thanks, and as nobody could hear a word amid the uproar I complacently took my seat while the officer skulked away, crestfallen. All that day and evening, and until one o'clock the next afternoon, a noisy rabble of self-styled temperance men sought to prevent bringing the question to a square and honorable vote. Major George Williams, a brave man who had lost a limb in fighting for his country, at last succeeded in wearying the chairman into a semblance of duty. The result was a triumph for the advocates of suffrage. A recess was then taken, during which my hand was so often and enthusiastically shaken that my shoulder was severely lamed. The first thing in order after resuming business was my report as Legislative Committee. I advanced to the platform amid deafening cheers and, as soon as I could make myself heard, said, in substance, that the legislature had decided that it was an insult to womanhood to grant women the right to vote on intemperance and debar them from voting on all honorable questions. I then offered a fair and unequivocal woman suffrage resolution, which was triumphantly carried. The disappointed minority seceded from the Alliance and set up a "Union" for themselves; but their confederacy did not live long, and its few followers finally returned to their *alma mater* and gave us no further trouble.

Woman suffrage associations were formed in several counties during the year 1874. Our strength was now much increased by the able assistance of Mrs. H. A. Loughary, who suddenly took her place in the front rank as a platform speaker. The editorial work of the *New Northwest* received a valuable auxiliary in June of this year in the person of Catharine A. Coburn, a lady of rare journalistic ability, who held her position five years, when my sons, W. S., H. R. and W. C. Duniway, having completed their school duties and attained their majority, were admitted to partnership in the business. Mrs. Coburn now holds a situation on the editorial staff of the *Daily Oregonian*.

In the autumn of 1876 I was absent at the Centennial Exposition, whither I had gone in the summer in response to an invitation from the National Woman Suffrage Association to "Come over into Macedonia

and help." The work for equal rights made favorable headway in the legislature of Oregon that year through the influence of a convention held at Salem under the able leadership of Mrs. H. A. Loughary and Dr. Mary A. Thompson.

In June, 1878, a convention met in Walla Walla, Washington territory, for the purpose of forming a constitution for the proposed new State of Washington, and in compliance with the invitation of many prominent women of the territory I visited the convention and was permitted to present a memorial in person, praying that the word "male" be omitted from the fundamental law of the incubating State. But my plea (like that of Abigail Adams a century before) failed of success, through a close vote however—it stood 8 to 7—and men went on as before, saying, as they did in the beginning: "Women do not wish to vote. If they desire the ballot let them ask for it." In September of that year I was again at my post in the Oregon legislature circulating the *New Northwest* among the law-makers, and doing what else I could to keep the cause before them in a manner to enlist their confidence and command their respect. An opportunity was given me at this session to make an extended argument upon constitutional liberty before a joint convention of the two Houses, which occupied an hour in delivery and was accorded profound attention. I was much opposed to the growing desire of the legislature to shirk its responsibility upon the voters at large by submitting a proposed constitutional amendment to them when the constitution nowhere prohibits women from voting, and I labored to show that all we need is a declaratory act extending to us the franchise under the existing fundamental law. Dr. Mary A. Thompson followed in a brief speech and was courteously received. The Married Woman's Property bill, passed in 1874, received some necessary amendments at this session, and an act entitling women to vote upon school questions and making them eligible to school offices, was passed by a triumphant majority.

I went to Southern Oregon in 1879, and while sojourning in Jacksonville was assailed with a shower of eggs (since known in that section as "Jacksonville arguments") and was also burned in effigy on a principal street after the sun went down. Jacksonville is an old mining town, beautifully situated in the heart of the Southern Oregon mountains, and has no connection with the outside world except through the daily stage-coaches. Its would-be leading men are old miners or refugees from the bushwhacking district whence they were driven by the civil war. The taint of slavery is yet upon them and the methods of border-ruffians are their hearts' delight. It is true that there are many good people among them, but they are often over-awed by the lawless crowd whose very instincts lead them to oppose a republican form of government. But that raid of the outlaws proved a good thing for the woman suffrage movement. It aroused the better classes, and finally shamed the border ruffians by its own reäction. When I returned to Portland a perfect ovation awaited me. Hundreds of men and women who had not before allied themselves with the movement made haste to do so. The newspapers were filled with severe denunciations of the mob, and "Jackson-villains,"

as the perpetrators of the outrage were styled, grew heartily disgusted over their questionable glory.

When the legislature met in the autumn of 1880 it was decided by the Woman Suffrage Association that we could "raise the blockade" and encourage agitation in the work by consenting to an attempt to amend the State constitution. Pursuant to this decision a resolution was offered in the Senate by Hon. W. C. Fulton of Clatsop, and in the House by Hon. Lee Laughlin, which, after considerable discussion *pro* and *con* in which I was graciously invited to participate on the floor of both Houses, was passed by the requisite two-thirds majority. The result was considered a triumph for the cause. A grand ratification jubilee was held in the opera-house in honor of the event, and resolutions of thanks to the lawmakers were passed, accompanied by many expressions of faith in the legislation of the future.

In the meantime the work was going steadily on in Washington territory, my own labors being distributed about equally between the two sections of the Pacific Northwest that had formerly been united under one territorial government. In the autumn of 1881 the legislature of Washington met one afternoon in joint convention to listen to arguments from Hon. William H. White and myself, on which occasion I held the floor for nearly three hours, in the midst of an auditory that was itself an inspiration. Mr. White, a Democrat of the old school, and now (1885) holding the office of United States marshal in the territory, under commission from President Cleveland, based his plea for woman suffrage upon the enfranchisement of the colored men, urging it strongly as a means of Democratic retaliation. The suffrage bill passed in the House on the following day by a majority of two, but was defeated in the Council by a majority of two, showing that the vote would have been a tie if taken under the joint-ballot rule.

Returning to Oregon I renewed the contest, and in the autumn of 1882 we were all gratified by the passage of the pending constitutional amendment by a very nearly unanimous vote of each House. Then the Oregon campaign began in earnest. The question had assumed formidable proportions and was no longer an ignored issue. The work went on with accelerated speed, and as far as could be ascertained there was little or no opposition to it. The meetings were largely attended and affirmative speakers were ready to assist at all times, the help of this kind representing all grades of the professions, led by the best and most influential men of the State everywhere.

Another year went by, and the time for assembling the Washington territory legislature was again at hand. Immediately upon arriving at Olympia I learned that a coterie of politicians, finding open hostility no longer effectual, had combined to crush the woman suffrage bill, which had passed the House trimuphantly, by lobbying a "substitute" through the Council. In pursuance of this seemingly plausible idea they talked with the ladies of Olympia and succeeded in convincing a few of them that all women, and especially all leaders of the movement, must be kept away from the capitol or the bill would certainly be defeated. Several

women who ought to have have known better were deceived by these specious pleaders, and but for some years of experience in legislative assemblies that had brought me to comprehend the "ways that are dark and tricks that are vain," for which the average politician is "peculiar," the ruse would have succeeded. I remained at headquarters, enduring alike the open attacks of the venal press and the more covert opposition of the saloons and brothels, and, as vigilantly as I could, watched all legislative movements, taking much pains to keep the public mind excited through the columns of the *Daily Oregonian* and the weekly issues of the *New Northwest*. The bill, which had been prepared by Professor William H. Roberts, passed the House early in the session; but it tarried long in the Council, and those most interested were well-nigh worn out with work and watching before the measure reached a vote. It came up for final passage November 15, 1883, when only three or four women were present. The Council had been thoroughly canvassed before-hand and no member offered to make a speech for or against it. The deathly stillness of the chamber was broken only by the clerk's call of the names and the firm responses of the "ayes" and "noes." I kept the tally with a nervous hand, and my heart fairly stood still as the fateful moment came that gave us the majority. Then I arose and without exchanging words with any one left the state-house and rushed toward the telegraph-office, half a mile distant, my feet seeming to tread the air. Judge J. W. Range of Cheney, president of a local woman suffrage society, overtook me on the way, bound on the same errand. He spoke, and I felt as if called back to earth with a painful reminder that I was yet mortal. A few minutes more and my message was on the way to the *New Northwest*. It was publication-day and the paper had gone to press, but my jubilant and faithful sons opened the forms and inserted the news, and in less than half an hour the newsboys were crying the fact through the streets of Portland, making the *New Northwest*, which had fought the fight and led the work to the point where legislation could give a victory, the very first paper in the nation to herald the news to the world. The rejoicing in Oregon, as well as in Washington territory, was most inspiriting. A bloodless battle had been fought and won, and the enemy, asleep in carnal security, had been surrendered unawares. The women of Oregon thanked God and took courage.

After passing the Council the bill passed leisurely, and some of us feared perilously, through the various stages of clerical progress till November 22, when it received the signature of Governor William A. Newell, who used a gold pen presented him for the purpose by women whom his act made free. And when at a given signal the church bells rang in glad acclaim, and the loud boom of minute-guns reverberated from the forest-clothed hills that border Puget Sound and lost itself at last in the faint echoes of the far-off hights, the scroll of the dead century unrolled before my inner vision and I beheld in spirit another scene on the further verge of the continent, when men in designing to ring the bell at Independence Hall in professed honor of the triumph of liberty, although not a woman in the land was free, had sought in vain to force the loyal metal into glad

responses; for the old bell quivered in every nerve and broke its heart rather than tell a lie!

An immense ratification jubilee was held in the evening of the same day at the city hall in Olympia, with many distinguished speakers.* Similar meetings were subsequently held in all the principal towns of the Pacific Northwest. The freed women of Washington thankfully accepted their new prerogatives. They were appointed as jurors in many localities, and have ever since performed their duties with eminent satisfaction to judges, lawyers and all clients who are seeking to obey the laws. But their jurisdiction soon became decidedly uncomfortable for the law-breaking elements, which speedily escaped to Oregon, where, as the sequel proved, they began a secret and effective war upon the pending constitutional amendment. We all knew we had a formidable foe to fight at the ballot-box. Our own hands were tied and our own guns spiked, while our foe was armed to the teeth with ballots, backed by money and controlled by vice, bigotry and tyranny. But the leading men of the State had long been known to favor the amendment; the respectable press had become mildly, and in a few cases earnestly acquiescent; no opposition could be raised at any of our public meetings, and we felt measurably sure of a victory until near election time, when we discovered to our dismay that most of the leading politicians upon whom we had relied for aid had suddenly been seized with an alarming reticence. They ceased to attend the public meetings and in every possible way ignored the amendment, lest by openly allying themselves with it they might lose votes; and as all of them were posing in some way for office, for themselves or friends, and women had no votes with which to repay their allegiance, it was not strange that they should thus desert us.

Our Republican senator in congress, Hon. J. N. Dolph, favored the Woman Suffrage Association with an able and comprehensive letter, which was widely circulated, urging the adoption of the amendment as a measure of justice and right, and appealing to the voters to make Oregon the banner State of the great reform. Leading clergymen, especially of Portland, preached in favor of woman suffrage, prominent among them being Rev. T. L. Eliot, pastor of the Unitarian church; Chaplain R. S. Stubbs of the Church of Sea and Land, and Rev. Frederic R. Marvin of the First Congregational society. Appeals to voters were widely circulated from the pens and speeches of many able gentlemen.† Not one influential man made audible objection anywhere.

We had carefully districted and organized the State, sparing neither labor nor money in providing "Yes" tickets for all parties and all candidates and putting them everywhere in the hands of friends for use at the polls. But the polls were no sooner open than it began to appear that the battle was one of great odds. Masked batteries were opened in almost

* Governor Newell, Judge Orange Jacobs, Judge B. F. Dennison, Mrs. Pamela Hale, Hon. Philip D. Moore, Mr. W. S. Duniway, Captain William H. Smallwood, the writer, and a large number of the members of the legislature.

† S. F. Chadwick, United States Representative M. C. George, ex-United States Senator J. H. Mitchell, United States District Judge M. P. Deady, Hon. H. W. Scott, editor of the *Oregonian*, ex-Governor A. C. Gibbs, District-Attorneys J. F. Caples and T. A. McBride, and various ex-members of the legislature.

Digitized by Google

every precinct, and multitudes of legal voters who are rarely seen in daylight except at a general election, many of whom were refugees from Washington territory, crowded forth from their hiding-places to strike the manacled women down. They accused the earnest ladies who had dared to ask for simple justice of every crime in the social catalogue. Railroad gangs were driven to the polls like sheep and voted against us in battalions. But, in spite of all this, nearly one-third of the vote was thrown in our favor, requiring a change of only about one-fourth of the opposing vote to have given us a victory, and proving to the amazement of our enemies that the strength of our cause was already formidable.* We were repulsed but not conquered. Before the smoke of the battle had cleared away we had called immense meetings and passed vigorous resolutions, thanking the lovers of liberty who had favored us with their suffrages, and pledging ourselves anew to the conflict.

We at once decided that we would never again permit the legislature to remand us to the rabble in a vain appeal for justice. We had demonstrated the impossibility of receiving a fair, impartial vote at the hands of the ignorant, lawless and unthinking multitude whose ballots outweigh all reason and overpower all sense. In pursuance of this purpose I went to the legislature of 1885 and found no difficulty in securing the aid of friendly members of both Houses who kindly championed the following bill:

Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of Oregon:

That the elective franchise shall not hereafter be denied to any person in this State on account of sex.

This act to be in force from and after its approval by the governor.

After much parliamentary fillibustering the vote of both Houses was recorded upon this bill and stood conjointly 34 to 54. This vote, coming so soon after our defeat at the polls, is regarded as the greatest victory we have yet won. The ablest lawyers of the State and of Washington territory are preparing elaborate opinions showing the constitutionality of our present plan, and these are to be published in the form of a standard work, with appropriate references for convenient use. The movement exhibits a healthy, steady and encouraging growth, and is much accelerated by its success in Washington territory.

On the Fourth of July of this year a grand celebration was held at Vancouver, on Washington soil, the women of Oregon having resolved in large numbers that they would never again unite in celebrating men's independence-day in a State where they are denied their liberty. The celebration was a success from first to last. Boys and girls in equal numbers rode in the liberty-car and represented the age of the government. The military post at Vancouver joined heartily in the festivities, headed by the gallant soldier, General Nelson A. Miles, commander-in-chief of the department of the Columbia. The fine Fourteenth Infantry Band furnished the instrumental music, and a local choir rendered spirited choruses. The New Declaration of Independence was read by Josie De Vore Johnson, the oration was delivered by Mattie A. Bridge, and Louise

* The official vote of the State was 11,223 for the amendment, and 28,176 against.

Digitized by Google

Lester, the famous *prima donna*, electrified the delighted crowd by her triumphant rendition of the "Star-Spangled Banner." The exercises closed with the announcement by the writer, who had officiated as president of the day, that the Executive Committee of the Oregon Woman Suffrage Association had, during the noon recess, adopted the following resolutions:

Resolved, That our thanks are due to General Nelson A. Miles of the department of the Columbia for his valuable coöperation in the exercises and entertainments of this historic day.

Resolved, That we thank the citizens of Clarke county, and especially of Vancouver, for their hospitality and kindness, so graciously bestowed upon their less fortunate Oregon neighbors, who have not yet achieved their full independence, and we shall ever cherish their fraternal recognition in grateful remembrance.

Resolved, That while we deplore the injustice that still deprives the women of Oregon of the liberty to exercise their right to the elective franchise, we rejoice in the record the women of Washington are making as citizens, as voters and as jurors. We congratulate them upon their newly-acquired liberties, and especially upon the intelligent and conscientious manner in which they are discharging the important public duties that in no wise interfere with their home affairs. And we are further

Resolved, That if our own fathers, husbands, sons and brothers do not at the next session of the Oregon legislature bestow npon us the same electoral privileges which the women of Washington already enjoy, we will prepare to cross the Columbia river and take up our permanent abode in this "land of the free and home of the brave."

The resolutions evoked cheers that waked the echoes, and the celebration, reported by the Oregon press, contributed largely to the growth of the equal-rights sentiment among the people of the State. Two stanzas of a spirited poem are subjoined, written for the Woman Suffrage Association just after our defeat at the polls, by a young man from Southern Oregon who has withheld his own name but included the names of all the counties in his glorious prophecy:

From Clatsop and from Clackamas, from Linn and Tillamook;
From Grant, Multnomah, Lane and Coos, and Benton, Lake and Crook;
From Josephine, Columbia, and loyal Washington,
And Union, Baker and Yamhill, and proud old Marion;
From where the Cascade mountain-streams their foaming waters pour,
We're coming, mothers, sisters, dear, "ten times ten thousand more."

From Klamath's lakes and Wasco's plains, and Jackson's rolling hills;
From Douglas with her mines of gold, and Curry with her mills;
From Umatilla's burdened fields, and hills and dales of Polk,
We're coming with our votes and songs to break the tyrant's yoke,
And in the ears of Liberty this song of joy we'll pour,
We're coming, mothers, sisters, dear, "ten times ten thousand more."

Mrs. Mary Olney Brown gives an amusing account of her attempts to vote in Washington territory. The incidents related occurred several years before the passage of the act specifically enfranchising women. She says:

I do not think there has ever been a session of our legislature that has not had before it the subject of woman suffrage. It has been my habit to write out, and send to all parts of the territory, before the assembling of each legislature, petitions to be signed, asking for a law guaranteeing to

women the exercise of their right to vote. These petitions were not without their effect, though no one knew who sent them out, or, when returned, who selected the member to receive and present them to the legislature. At the session of 1867, mainly through the efforts of Edward Eldridge of Whatcom county, an act was passed giving "all white American citizens above the age of twenty-one years" the right to vote. This law is still on our statute books; but, like the fourteenth amendment, is interpreted to mean only male citizens. During the time between the passage of this law and the next election, I wrote to some of the prominent women of the principal towns, telling them of the law, and urging them to go out and vote at the coming election, and also to induce as many more to go as they could. But no notice was taken of my letters. I was looked upon as a fanatic, and the idea of a woman voting was regarded as an absurdity. The law seemed to be in advance of the people. It needed lectures and organized societies among us to educate the women into a just appreciation of their rights and duties.

In the autumn of 1868, Dr. Smith wrote several articles on the right of women to the ballot, as did also Mr. Eldridge. The latter asserted that it was the intention of the law to give the women of the territory the right to vote; that being a member of the legislature he had purposely stated in his remarks, that if the bill passed in that form, it would give the women the right to vote; and a member from his seat cried out, "That is what we want!" Mr. Eldridge urged the women to go out to the polls and vote. These articles were published in the Olympia *Transcript*, the Republican paper, J. N. Gale, one of the editors, being an advocate of suffrage. Still not a woman made a move. Many wished to vote; they knew it was the only way to secure their rights, and yet they had not the courage to go to the polls in defiance of custom.

Seeing this to be the case, and knowing that if anything was done some one must take the initiative, I determined to cast aside my timidity and set the ball rolling. Accordingly, several weeks before the election of 1869 I gave out word that I was going to the polls to vote. I had the previous year removed with my family from Olympia, and was living on White River in King county. The announcement that I would attend the election caused a great commotion in White River precinct. A fearful hue and cry was raised. The news reached Olympia and Seattle, and some of the papers deprecated the idea that "a woman should unsex herself by dabbling in the filthy pool of politics." But I was fully committed. The law had been on our statute books for nearly three years. If it was intended for our benefit, it was time we were availing ourselves of it. So, nothing daunted, I determined to repair to the polling place, the district school-house, accompanied by my husband, my daughter (Mrs. Axtell) and her husband—a little band of four—looked upon with pity and contempt for what was called our "fanaticism."

For several days before the election the excitement in the neighborhood and other settlements along the river was intense. Many gentlemen called on me and tried to persuade me to stay at home and save myself from insult. I thanked them for their kindness, and told them I fully

appreciated their good intentions, but that I had associated with men all my life, and had always been treated as a lady; that the men I should meet at the polls were the same that I met in church and social gatherings, and I knew they would treat me with respect. Then they begged my husband not to allow me to go; but he told them his wife had as good a right to vote as he had; and that no citizen can legally deprive another of the right to vote.

On the morning of the election, just before we reached the school-house, a man met us and said, "Mr. Brown, look here now! If Mrs. Brown goes up to vote she will be insulted! If I was in your place I wouldn't let her go any farther. She had better go back." My husband answered, "Mr. Brannan, my wife has as good a right to vote as I have, and I would not prevent her if I could. She has a mind of her own and will do as she thinks best, and I shall stand by her and see that she is well treated! Besides [speaking with emphasis], she will not be insulted either!" "Well," said the man, "if she was my wife she shouldn't go! She'll be sure to be insulted!" I looked him full in the face, and said with decision, "Mr. Brannan, a gentleman will be a gentleman under all circumstances, and will always treat a lady with respect." I said this because I knew the man, and knew that if anyone offered any annoyance, it would be he, and so it proved.

As we drove up to the school-house and alighted, a man in an angry voice snapped out, "Well! if the women are coming to vote, I'm going home!" But he did not go; he had too much curiosity; he wanted to see the fun. He stayed and was converted. After watching the sovereign "white male citizen" perform the laborious task of depositing his vote in the ballot-box, I thought if I braced myself up I might be equal to the task. So, summoning all my strength, I walked up to the desk behind which sat the august officers of election, and presented my vote. When behold! I was pompously met with the assertion, "You are not an American citizen; hence not entitled to vote." The great unabridged dictionary of Noah Webster was opened, and the definition of the word citizen read to me. They all looked to see me vanquished; they thought I would have to retreat before such an overwhelming array of sagacity. The countenances of the judges wore a pleased expression that they had hit on so easy an expedient to put me *hors du combat*, while the crowd looked astonished that I did not sink out of sight. Waiting a moment, I said, "The definition is correct. A citizen of the United States, is a *person* owing allegiance to the government; but then all persons are not *men;* and the definition of "citizeness" is a female citizen. I claim to be an American citizen, and a native-born citizen at that; and I wish to show you from the fourteenth amendment to the coustitution of the United States, that women are not only citizens having the constitutional right to vote, but also that our territorial election law gives women the privilege of exercising that right."

When I commenced speaking, all the men, with the exception of two —the one who had urged my husband not to let me go to the school-house, and a low, degraded fellow, who had a squaw for a wife—came and

ranged themselves around me and the judges before whom I stood, and listened attentively. It was a new subject to them. They had heard of woman suffrage, but only in ridicule. Now it was being presented to them in a very different light. As I proceeded there was a death-like stillness, so intent were they to catch every word. Even the man who had declared he would go home if the women were going to vote, was among the most interested of the listeners. There was but one interruption; the two men, of whom I have spoken, to make good their assertion that I would be insulted, got behind a desk in the far corner of the room, and began talking and laughing very loudly; but they were promptly called to order. Silence being restored, I went on to show them that the original constitution recognized women as citizens, and that the word citizen includes both sexes, as is proved by the phrases, "male citizen," and "female citizen"; that women from the beginning had been unjustly deprived of the exercise of their constitutional rights; that they had for years been petitioning those in power to restore them to their political freedom, when the emancipation of the Southern slaves threw upon the country a class of people, who, like the women of the nation, owed allegiance to the government, but whose citizenship was not recognized. To settle this question, the fourteenth amendment was adopted. Its first section declares emphatically who are citizens, and guarantees to them the exercise of all their natural rights under the equal protection of the law. (Here I read to them the section.) No distinction is made in regard to sex; the word "person" being used, which includes both men and women.

"And now, honorable gentlemen," I said, in conclusion, "I am a 'person,' declared by the fourteenth amendment to be a citizen, and still further, I am a native-born citizen of the same race and color of these gentlemen by whom I am surrounded, and whose votes you do not hesitate to receive; and, had our territorial law failed to give me the right to vote, this amendment would protect me in the exercise of it. I again offer my vote, and hope you will not refuse it." No hand was extended to receive it; but one of the judges threw himself back in his seat, and with great dignity of manner and an immense display of ignorance, exclaimed, "Women have no right to vote; and the laws of congress don't extend over Washington territory." This was too much for even the strongest opponents. On every side was heard, "Oh, Mr. Alvord! why, yes, they do!" "Mr. Alvord, you are mistaken, the laws of congress do extend over our territory"; and some tried to explain to him that the territory belonged to the United States and was under the jurisdiction of the national government, and that of course the laws of congress extended over it. But still more pompously, he again declared, "It is no such thing, the laws of congress don't extend over Washington territory." A look of disgust and shame was depicted on nearly every countenance, and the cause of woman suffrage had advanced perceptibly in the minds of the audience.

Another of the judges arose, and said, he had never thought much on the subject. He had no doubt but Mrs. Brown was right, women were

citizens and had the right to vote; but as the courts had not instructed the election officers to take the votes of women, and as the precinct was a small one, he was afraid their whole vote would be thrown out if they received the women's ballots. So, although he should like to see the women have their rights, he should have to refuse Mrs. Brown's vote. Here an Irishman called out, "It would be more sensible to let an intelligent white woman vote than an ignorant nigger." Cries of "Good for you, Pat! good for you, Pat!" indicated the impression that had been made. My daughter now went up and offered her vote, which was, of course, rejected.

My going to the polls was noised abroad, and set men as well as women thinking. They examined the law for themselves, and found that women had a right to vote, so that before the next election many were prepared to act. In May, 1870, I published an appeal to the women of the territory, quoting to them the law, and urging them to avail themselves of its provisions by going to the polls and voting. My sister, Charlotte Olney French, living in Grand Mound precinct, some twenty-five miles from Olympia, began talking the matter up; and, being a woman of energy and influence, she soon had the whole neighborhood interested. With the assistance of an old lady, Mrs. Peck, she planned a regular campaign. By the programme the women were to get up a picnic dinner at the school-house where the election was to be held, and directly after, while the officers of election were in good humor (wives will understand the philosophy of this), they were to present their votes. My sister, being a good talker and well informed on all the constitutional, judicial and social phases of the question as well as a good judge of human nature, was able to meet and parry every objection, and give information where needed, so that by the time dinner was over, the judges, as well as everybody else, were in the best of spirits. When the voting was resumed, the women (my sister being the first) handed in their ballots as if they had always been accustomed to voting, and everything passed off pleasantly. One lady, Mrs. Sargent, seventy-two years old, said she thanked the Lord that He had let her live until she could vote. She had often prayed to see the day, and now she was proud to cast her first ballot.

It had been talked of for some days before the election in the adjoining precinct—Black River—that Mrs. French was organizing a party of women to attend the election in Grand Mound precinct; but they were not sure the judges would let them vote. "If they do," said they, "if the Grand Mound women vote, the Black River women shall!" So they stationed a man on a fleet horse, at the Grand Mound polls, with instructions to start as soon as the women began to vote, and ride with all haste back to their precinct and let them know. The moment the man rode in sight of the school-house he swung his hat, and screeched at the top of his voice, "They're voting! They're voting!" The teams were all ready in anticipation of the news, and were instantly flying in every direction, and soon the women were ushered into the school-house, their choice of tickets furnished them, and all allowed to vote as "American citizens."

While the women of these two precincts were enjoying the exercise of

their political rights, the women of Olympia were suffering the vexation of disappointment. I had been stopping there for some weeks previous to the election, trying to induce the women to go to the polls, and also to convince the men that women had a legal right to vote, and that their right must be respected. The day before election the judges were interviewed as to whether they would take the votes of the women. They replied, "Yes; we shall be obliged to take them. The law gives them the right to vote, and we can not refuse." This decision was heralded all over the city, and women felt as if their millennium had come. To-morrow, for the first time, their voice would be heard in the government through the ballot. All day long women met each other, and asked: "Are you going to the election to-morrow?" Groups gathered in parlors and discussed the matter, and everything seemed auspicious.

But how true the saying: "There's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip!" Before nine o'clock the next morning, the word had been communicated all over town that "the women need not come out to the polls as the judges would not take their votes." They would give no reason why, but said "they had decided not to take the votes of the women." About a dozen of us gathered together to consult what was best to be done; finding most of them inclined to back out, I urged the necessity of our making an effort; that whether the judges took our votes or not, it was not best to give it up as the rest had done; if we did, it would be harder to make an effort next time; that I had been to the polls once and had my vote refused, and could be refused again; at any rate, I had the right to vote, and I should go and offer it if I had to go alone. Three of the number said they would go with me—Mrs. Patterson, Mrs. Wiley and Mrs. Dofflemyer; these, with Mr. Patterson, my husband and myself made our party. As we reached the court-house where the election was held, Mr. Dofflemyer met us and took his wife home, she meekly submitting.

Just before us a cart rattled up bearing a male citizen, who was too drunk to know what he was doing, or even to do anything. He was lying on his back in the cart, with feet and hands up, hurrahing at the top of his voice. This disgusting, drunken idiot was picked up out of the cart by two men, who put a ticket into his hand, carried him to the window (he was too drunk to stand), shoved him up and raised his arm into the aperture; his vote received, he was tumbled back into the cart.

I then stepped up and offered my vote, and was answered with, "We have decided not to take the votes of the women!" "On what grounds do you refuse?" I asked. No answer. "Do you refuse it on legal grounds?" Still no answer. I then said, "Under the election law of this territory, setting aside my constitutional right as a citizen of the United States, I have the right to vote at this election. Have you the election law by you?" "No, we have not got it here," they said. I knew they had, but did not dispute their word. "Very well," I said, "I can quote it for you." I did so, and then said, "Under this territorial law I claim my right, and again I offer you my vote as an American citizen. If you doubt my citizenship, I will insist on taking the oath. Will you receive it?" The answer was, "No; we have decided not to take women's votes, and we

cannot take yours." "Then," said I, "it amonnts to this: the law gives women the right to vote in this territory, and you three men who have been appointed to receive our votes, sit here and arbitrarily refuse to take them, giving no reason why, only that you have decided not to take the women's votes. There is no law to sustain you in this usurpation of power. We can claim legal redress. Are you willing to stand a legal prosecution?" "Yes," was the response of each one separately. It was now plain to see why the votes of the women were refused; the judges had been hired to do the dirty work, and money pledged in case of prosecution. They were men in moderate circumstances and could not have stood the cost of a suit individually. The ready assent they gave showed such a contingency had been thought of and provided against by the opponents of woman suffrage. The other two women then offered their votes, which were also refused.

In the autumn of 1871 Susan B. Anthony came to Olympia and attended the first woman suffrage convention ever held here. Our legislature was in session, and a joint hearing before the two Houses was extended to her. Her statesman-like argument clearly proved the right of our women to vote under both the national constitution and the territorial law. After Miss Anthony left, there arose a rumor that the election law was to be repealed, and a committee of women attended every session, determined if possible to prevent it. They were at the capitol the last day, prepared to stay until the adjournment; they were urged to go home, but would not unless a solemn promise was made them that the law should in no way be tampered with. This the members refused to do, until a bright idea struck one of them, which was that they need not disturb the law, but could make it inoperative by enacting another statute. This being whispered among the members, the promise was given, and the women retired. Immediately after, the following act was passed by both Houses, approved and signed by the governor:

Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Washington:

SECTION 1. That hereafter no female shall have the right of ballot, or vote at any poll or election precinct in this territory until the Congress of the United States of America shall, by direct legislation, declare the same to be the supreme law of the land.

SEC. 2. This act to take effect from and after its passage.

Approved November 29, 1871. EDWARD S. SOLOMON, *Governor.*

When the proclamation to hold a convention to form a constitution preparatory to our admission into the Union as a State, was issued, I recommended to the Territorial Woman Suffrage Association that we make every effort to secure to the convention as many delegates as possible in favor of woman suffrage, and then that we circulate petitions asking them to leave out the word "male" from the constitution. Failing to get the society to take any associated action, I went to work individually, wrote and sent out petitions into every town and country place where there was a post-office, asking that the word "male" be left out of the constitution. With each petition I sent a letter to the person whose name I had procured from the postmaster of the place, stating the object, urging a thorough circulation, and directing its return at a given date to

Mary Olney Brown, President of the Washington Territorial Woman Suffrage Association; thus giving the credit of the work to the Society.

I could not get a member of our Association to circulate the petition in Olympia, so every day that I could get away from home I took my petition in hand and canvassed for signatures. If I went shopping or on an errand I took it with me, and in that way I procured over 300 names. My experience had taught me that the principal opposition to woman's voting came from ignorance as to her true position under the government. She had come to be looked upon almost as a foreign element in our nation, having no lot nor part with the male citizen, and I felt that it was necessary to disabuse the minds of the people generally, and the delegates to the convention particularly, of this notion. I therefore wrote five articles on the "Equality of Citizenship," which Mrs. Duniway kindly published in the *New Northwest*. The Olympia *Courier* also printed them, and placed the paper on file in the city reading-room; and when I met a man who had not made up his mind on the subject I recommended him to the reading-room, and several after perusing the articles were converted and signed the petition.

On the assembling of the legislature Mrs. A. H. H. Stuart and myself watched a favorable opportunity to present an equal rights bill. We let them talk up the matter pretty well over a petition signed by fifty women of one of the upper counties, when one day Mrs. Stuart came to me and said: "Now, Mrs. Brown, write out your bill; the speaker of the House sent me word they were ready for it." I sat down and framed a bill* to the best of my ability, which was duly presented and respectfully debated. Mrs. Dnniway came from Portland to urge its passage, and the day before it came to a vote both Houses adjourned and invited her to speak in the hall of representatives. She made one of her best speeches. The members of both Houses were present, besides a large audience from the city. The next day the House passed the bill by two majority, and on the day following it was lost in the Council by two majority. In the House the vote stood, ayes, 13; nays, 11. In the Council, ayes, 5; nays, 7.

Saturday evening Mrs. Duniway made another telling speech in the city hall, at the close of which Mr. White, a lobby member, made a few remarks, in which he disclosed the cause of the defeat of the bill in the Council. He said, after the bill passed the House the saloon-keepers, alarmed lest their occupation would be gone if women should vote, button-holed the members of the Council, and as many of them as could be bought by drinks pledged themselves to vote against the bill. The members of the Council were present, and though an urgent invitation was given to all to speak, not one of them denied the charge made by Mr. White. On the following Monday an effort was made in the Council to reconsider the bill, but failed. Thus stands our cause at present.

---

* *Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Washington:*

SECTION 1. All female citizens of the age of twenty-one years shall be entitled to vote at all elections in the territory, subject only to such regulations as male citizens.

SEC. 2. Any officer of election who shall refuse to take the vote of a woman citizen (otherwise qualified to vote), shall be liable to a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $500.

SEC. 3. All laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. This act to be in force on and after its passage.

There will be a greater effort than ever before put forth during the next two years to secure an affirmative vote in our legislature.

As Mrs. Brown wrote the above in 1881, the promise in the closing sentence was really quite prophetic, since the legislature of 1883 passed a law enfranchising the women of the territory.* Mrs. Duniway concludes her account with a brief reference to the work in neighboring territories:

In addition to all that is being done in Oregon and Washington, we are actively engaged in pushing the work in Idaho and Montana territories, where the *New Northwest* has been thoroughly circulated in many localities and many spirited public meetings have been held. The Idaho legislature seriously considered and came near adopting a woman suffrage bill last winter, and the women of the territory are confidently awaiting a triumph at the next biënnial session. Remembering Dakota's set-back through the governor's veto in 1885, they are carefully planning to avoid a like calamity in their own territory. In Montana the cause has made less apparent progress, but there is much quiet and constantly increasing agitation in its favor. Popular feeling is steadily ripening for the change, and let the rest of the world wag as it will, there cannot be much longer hindrance to the complete triumph of liberty in the Pacific Northwest.

* The bill was introduced in the Washington House by Representative Coply, and was supported in speeches by Messrs. Coply, Besserer, Miles, Clark and Stitzel, while Messrs. Landrum and Kincaid spoke against it. The vote was: *Ayes*—Besserer, Brooks, Clark, Coply, Foster, Goodell, Hungate, Kuhn, Lloyd, Martin, Miles, Shaw, Stitzel and Speaker Ferguson—14. *Noes*—Barlow, Brining, Landrum, Ping, Kincaid, Shoudy and Young—7. *Absent*—Blackwell, Turpin and Warner—3. The bill was favorably reported in the Council, November 15, by Chairman Burk of the Judiciary Committee. No one offered to speak on it. The vote stood: *Ayes*—Burk, Edmiston, Hale, Harper, Kerr, Power and Smith—7. *Noes*—Caton, Collins, Houghton, Whitehouse and President Truax—5. Governor W. A. Newell approved the bill November 22, 1883.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LV.

LOUISIANA—TEXAS—ARKANSAS—MISSISSIPPI.

St. Anna's Asylum, Managed by Women—Constitutional Convention, 1879—Women Petition—Clara Merrick Guthrie—Petition Referred to Committee on Suffrage—A Hearing Granted—Mrs. Keating—Mrs. Saxon—Mrs. Merrick—Col. John M. Sandige—Efforts of the Women all in Vain—Action in 1885—Gov. McEnery—The *Daily Picayune*—Women as Members of the School-Board—Physiology in the Schools—Miss Eliza Rudolph—Mrs. E. J. Nicholson—Judge Merrick's Digest of Laws—Texas—Arkansas—Mississippi—Sarah A. Dorsey.

I.—LOUISIANA.

MRS. CAROLINE E. MERRICK has furnished the following interesting facts from her native State, for which we feel ourselves deeply indebted:

Like the children of one family the States have a common resemblance, but they are various in character as in geographical outline. In Louisiana the Anglo-American finds himself side-by-side with inhabitants of French or Spanish descent, and in many of the country parishes the African freedmen outnumber all the rest.

St. Anna's Asylum in New Orleans is controlled and managed by a board of directors composed entirely of women. Among the inmates in 1878 was a German woman who had resided in the institution for many years. Finding herself in ill-health and fearing the approach of the end, she confided to the ladies of the board that she had a thousand dollars in bank which she wished to bequeath to the home where she had been provided for and sheltered so long. At her earnest request a will was drawn up in accordance with her wishes, and signed by members of the board who were present as witnesses. Shortly after, the woman died and her will was submitted to the proper authority for admission to probate. When the ladies were duly informed that the will was null and void, they naturally asked why, and were told that under Louisiana law women were not lawful witnesses to a will. Had they only called in the old darkey wood-sawyer, doing a day's work in the asylum yard, and had him affix his mark to the paper, the money would have accrued to the asylum; as it was, it went to the State.

Early in 1879, when a convention to make a new State constitution *

* Emily P Collins of Ponchatoula, Louisiana, wrote Miss Anthony. "Our State is to form a new constitution this spring. I feel that now if ever is the time to strike for woman's emancipation 'We, the people,' includes women as well as men, and regardless of former legislative enactments we should

Digitized by Google

had been called and was about to assemble in New Orleans, Mrs. Merrick tried to arouse the ladies of the board, representing to them that in the controlling power they exercised over St. Anna's Asylum they were only children *playing* they were a part of the people and citizens of the State, when in reality they were legally powerless to perform any free and independent act. The ladies were mortified by the position in which they found themselves but were not willing to take any step to remedy their pitiful case, not even to sign the petition which was afterwards drawn up by Mrs, Saxon and Mrs. Merrick to present to the constitution-makers to have these disabilities removed. The petition was as follows:

To the Honorable President and Members of the Convention of Louisiana, convened for the purpose of framing a new Constitution:

The undersigned, citizens of the State of Louisiana, respectfully represent:

That up to the present time all women, of whatever age or capacity, have been debarred from the right of representation, notwithstanding the burdensome taxes which they have paid.

They have been excluded from holding any office save in cases of special tutorships in limited degree, or of administration only in specified cases.

They have been debarred from being witnesses to wills or notarial acts, even when executed by their own sex.

They look upon this condition of things as a grievance proper to be brought before your honorable body for consideration and relief.

As a question of civilization, we look upon the enfranchisement of women as an all-important one. In Wyoming, where it has been tried for ten years, the law-makers and clergy unite in declaring that this influx of women voters has done more to promote morality and order than thousands of armed men could have accomplished.

Should the entire franchise seem too extended a privilege, we most earnestly urge the adoption of a property qualification, and that women may be allowed a vote on school and educational matters, involving as they do the interests of women and children in a great degree.

So large a proportion of the taxes of Louisiana is paid by women, many of them without male representatives, that in granting consideration and relief for grievances herein complained of, the people will recognize justice and equity. To woman as well as man "taxation without representation is tyranny," she being "a person, a citizen, a freeholder, a tax-payer," the same as man, only government has never held out the same fostering, protecting hand to all alike, nor ever will, until women are directly represented.

Wherefore, we, your petitioners, pray that some suitable provision remedying these evils be incorporated in the constitution you are about to frame.

While this petition was being circulated, favorable articles appeared from time to time in the public prints. The following, signed "Fatima," the *nom de plume* of Clara Merrick Guthrie, appeared in the *Democrat:*

A well-known notary signed this petition with a flourish, remarking that "few women and not over half the men were aware of the disabilities of wives and daughters."

If the convention should invest women of property with the elective franchise it

be allowed to vote and be voted for as delegates to the constitutional convention. If I only had some one to aid me, or had your moral courage, I would proclaim myself a candidate for the constitutional convention. The colored people ought to sustain me for I have ever been their steadfast friend, and they themselves owe their emancipation chiefly to women. They cannot elect a colored man here, but could I have their support I have personal friends enough to secure my election. The parish ought to be stumped in support of some candidate whose efforts should be pledged to the insertion of a clause in the new constitution to prohibit future legislatures making sex a qualification for voting."

would give to the respectable side of politics a large body of sensible voters which would go far toward neutralizing the evil of unlimited male suffrage. The policy in the Northern States has been to demand unrestricted suffrage, but the women of Louisiana may with propriety exhibit certain variations in the nature of their appeal. This subject in all its phases inspires my enthusiasm, but I dare not be as eloquent as I might, lest a messenger should be sent to me with an urgent request to address the convention next Monday evening. * * * *

On dit.—Other ladies beside our brave Mrs. Saxon are desired to give their views. Now surely the convention would not ask these quiet house-mothers, who are not even remotely akin to professional agitators, to do such violence to their old-time precedents if the prospect of some reward were not encouraging and immediate. Nothing could induce me to make personal application save the solemn obligation of the whole august body to accede to my timid proposal simultaneously and by acclamation. Fortunately for us there are women in Louisiana more sacrificing of their naturally shrinking disposition, who perhaps take the cause more seriously than your correspondent, who would make a most persuasive enrolling-officer but not so gallant a general for active service.

After securing over 400 influential names* the petition was sent in to the convention and was referred to the Committee on Suffrage, Mr. Felix P. Poché, chairman, now judge of the Supreme Court. On May 7, the committee invited the ladies to a conference at Parlor P, St. Charles Hotel. Mr. and Mrs. Saxon, Colonel and Mrs. John M. Sandige and Mrs. Mollie Moore Davis were present. Mrs. Saxon spoke for an hour and replied to questions from the committee. She made a very favorable impression and was highly commended for her argument. On June 16 the friends of the petition were notified that a hearing would be granted them at the evening session of the convention. Mrs. Harriette C. Keating and Mrs. Elizabeth L. Saxon had consented to speak if such a hearing were granted.

Col. John M. Sandige, who had occupied prominent positions in the political affairs of the State, gave much encouragement and assistance. He did not hesitate to urge the importance of this movement, and the necessity that the women who were most interested should cheerfully assume their responsibility in relation to it. While Mrs. Saxon was known already as a fearless and able reformer, and Dr. Harriette C. Keating as a noble representative of woman in professional life, he thought it was desirable to have a voice from the home and from society, and Mrs. Caroline E. Merrick was solicited to come forward and endorse what her col-

* The following letter from Mrs. Saxon to Mrs. Minor gives the reason why she could not be present at the National Convention held in St. Louis:

"Almost entirely unaided I have gained 300 names in five weeks. Among them two Presbyterian ministers, wives of three others, seven of the most prominent physicians, all of the city administrators, two distinguished judges, several lawyers and many leading business men. I have begged Mrs. Emily P. Collins to urge upon the Association to meet here next year. I feel that now and before this convention is our most important work, so I must stay and try and influence the members all in my power. I was unaware of the action I was to take here, and if I get before the convention it will not be before the morning of the 7th, or I would come anyway as I have been offered a free passage by both rail and river. Mrs. Collins was with me for a few days and will assure you of my untiring efforts in the cause here. God knows I would be willing to buy fifteen minutes before the whole convention, the day they vote on that bill, by the sacrifice of my life; for remembering the grand women I have seen sacrificed along life's path, I think from their memory a power and eloquence would spring that might win hearts of steel and force justice to women from them. I will write again in a few days and report progress.

"Very sincerely your friend, E. L. SAXON."

"*May 5, 1879.*"

leagues would say, in a few words at the close of the proceedings. Mrs. Merrick finally agreed that she should see her duty in the light in which it was presented if Judge Merrick, who constituted her court of last resort, should leave her entirely free to act in the case. After a consultation, to her great surprise and consternation the judge said, "You have always desired to help women—here is an opportunity; go forward and do your share in this work."

The surprise could hardly have been greater if a procession of slaves twenty-five years ago had come up in force to the lordly mansion of their master with several spokesmen chosen from their ranks, for the avowed purpose of asking for their freedom. The ladies were treated with a delicate courtesy and kindness on this unusual occasion, which they can never forget. Judge Poché, with the tact of a true gentleman, endeavored to smooth a difficult way, reassuring the failing courage of the ladies while assisting them to mount the platform. The *Daily Picayune* of June 17, 1879, said:

The usually prosaic and unimpressive appearance of the convention hall assumed for the occasion an entire change last evening. When the convention closed its forenoon's labors, it took a recess until half-past 7 o'clock for the purpose of affording the female suffragists an opportunity to plead their cause before a full meeting. The scene before the convention was called to order was interesting and amusing. As the minutes rolled on the crowd of ladies commenced to pour in, and by 8 o'clock the hall contained some fifty representatives of the gentler sex of the Crescent City. Every age of womanhood and every class of beauty found a representative upon the floor. About half a dozen "society girls" occupied a retired corner of the room, while a number of the notables, including Mrs. Myra Clark Gaines, took possession of the middle of the hall.

Promptly at 8 o'clock President Wiltz climbed to his seat and called the convention to order in a tone slightly husky from nervous excitement. Secretary Harris, having summoned up his spare courage, called the roll in a determined voice. Of the 134 members 106 responded to their names. After the usual preliminaries Mr. Poché announced that a committee of ladies were in attendance, prepared to address the convention upon the question of woman suffrage. He then introduced Mrs. Dr. Keating. The fair speaker had scarcely begun before it was seen that she possessed a clear, slow enunciation and perfect confidence in her ability to enforce the doctrines of the cause she was to advocate. She read from manuscript and showed no little knowledge of the rules of oratory.

Mrs. Saxon was greeted with a burst of applause, which was gracefully acknowledged by the recipient; her address was earnest and made a deep impression.

Mr. Robertson of St. Landry then offered the following resolution, which lies over under the rules:

Resolved, That the committee on elective franchises be directed to embody in the article upon suffrage reported in this convention, a provision giving the right of suffrage to women upon the same terms as to men.

After some talk the resolution was laid aside to allow another speech to be made. Mrs. E. T. Merrick was introduced by Mr. Poché, as the wife of ex-Chief-Justice Merrick, and a shower of applause followed the appearance of the lady. She said:

Mr. President and Delegates of the Convention.—We have met with such unexpected kindness in the reception which you have accorded us to-night, that we find it hard to give expression to anything but thanks. When we remember the persistent and aggressive efforts which our energetic sisters of the North put forth before they could obtain a hearing before any legislative assembly, we find ourselves lost in a pleasing

Digitized by Google

astonishment at the graciousness which beams upon us here from all quarters. Should we even now be remanded to our places and have our petitions met with an utter refusal, we should be grieved to the heart, we should be sorely disappointed, but we never could cherish the least feeling of rebellious spite toward this convention of men, who have shown themselves so respectful and considerate toward the women of Louisiana.

Perhaps some of the gentlemen thought we did not possess the moral courage to venture even thus far from the retiremeut in which we prefer to dwell; perhaps they thought we would not dare to appear in person before this formidable body and speak for our own cause. Be assured that a resolute and conscientious woman can put aside her individual preferences at the call of duty, and act unselfishly for the good of others. You are our witnesses that we have not wearied you by our importunities, nor have we sought in any disingenuous manner to influence you in our favor. We are simply here in response to your own courteous invitation to explain our ideas and opinions on the great question of woman's enfranchisement. The ladies who have already addressed you have given you our arguments, and in eloquent language have made their appeal, to which you could not have been insensible. It only remains for me to give you some of my own individual views in the few words which are to conclude this interview.

We assure you we are not cherishing any ambitious ideas of political honors and emoluments for women. We do not wish to become governors or legislators, nor have we any inordinate desire to obtain seats in congress. I have seen but one woman who ever expressed even a wish to be president of these United States. But we do ask with most serious earnestness that you should give us the ballot, which has been truly called the expression of allegiance and responsibility to the government. All over the world this same movement is advancing. In many countries earnest, thoughtful, large-hearted women are working day and night to elevate their sex; to secure higher education; to open new avenues for their industrious hands; trying to make women helpers to man, instead of being millstones round his neck to sink him in his life struggle. Ah, if we could only infuse into your souls the courage which we, constitutionally timid as we are, now feel on this subject, you would hasten to perform this act of justice, and inaugurate the beginning of the end which all but the blind can see is surely and steadily approaching. We are willing to accept anything. We have always been in the position of beggars, as now, and cannot be choosers if we wished. We will gladly accept the franchise on any terms, provided they be wholly and entirely honorable. If you should see proper to subject us to an educational test, even of a high order, we should try to attain it; if you require a considerable property qualification, we would not complain. We would be only too grateful for any amelioration of our legal disabilities. Allow me to ask, are we less prepared for the intelligent exercise of the right of suffrage than were the freedmen when it was suddenly conferred upon them? Has not this right been to them a beneficial stimulant, inducing them to use exertions to promote their improvement, and has it not raised them to a superior place, above the disfranchised classes, such as the Chinese, Indians and women?

Perhaps you think only a few of us desire the ballot. If that were so, we think it would not be any sufficient reason for withholding it. In old times most of our slaves were happy and contented. Under the rule of good and humane masters, they gave themselves no trouble to grasp after a freedom which was beyond their reach. So it is with us to-day. We are happy and kindly treated (as witness our reception here to-night), and in the enjoyment of the numerous privileges which our chivalrous gentlemen are so ready to accord; many of us who feel a wish for freedom, do not venture even to whisper a single word about our rights. For the last twenty-five years I have occasionally expressed a desire to vote, and it was always received as a matter of surprise, but the sort of effect produced was as different as the characters of the individuals with whom I conversed. * * * *

Gentlemen of the convention, we now leave our cause in your hands, and commend it to your favorable consideration. We have pointed out to you the signs of the dawn-

Digitized by Google

ing of a better day for woman, which are so plain before our eyes, and implore you to reach out your hand and help us up, that we may catch the first glimpse of its glory before it floods the world with noon-day light.*

Col. John M. Sandidge read a letter from Mrs. Sarah A. Dorsey:

JUNE 11, 1879.

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention:—Too weak from recent illness and suffering to appear personally before you by the side of the women of Louisiana who are asking for the privilege and responsibility of political suffrage, I am forced to use this mode of indorsing their movement.

Being left by the fiat of God entirely alone in the world, with no man to represent me, having large interests in the State and no voice either in representation or taxation while hundreds of my negro lessees vote and control my life and property, I feel that I ought to say one word that may perhaps aid many other women whom fate has left equally destitute. It is doubtful whether I shall rise from my couch of pain to profit by the gift should the men of Louisiana decide to give the women of the State the right which is the heritage of the Anglo-Saxon race—repesentation for taxation. But still I ask it for my sisters and for the future of the race. We women of Louisiana have always been treated before the law as civil partners of our husbands. In every respect our rights have been protected.

It needs but one more step to make us civilly free, and this we ask you to embody in your new constitution. Many men are not opposed to the fact of female suffrage, but to its mode at present; that could be corrected, and women need not be exposed to the coarseness and strife of the polls as they are now conducted. There is no man among you who does not believe his wife or his daughter intelligently capable of taking a voice in the government. If my lessees are capable of being citizens of Louisiana, it is because for thirty years of my life and for five generations of my ancestors we have interested ourselves in their civilization and in their instruction. Gentlemen, we ask nothing that would unsex ourselves. We do not expect to do man's work; we can never pass the limits which nature herself has set. But we ask for justice; we ask for removal of unnatural restrictions that are contrary to the elemental spirit of the civil law; we do not ask for rights, but for permission to assume our natural responsibilities.

Praying that the hearts and minds of the men of Louisiana may be moved toward this act of justice, I am, with profound respect, your obedient servant,

SARAH A. DORSEY.

The Webster *Tribune*, Mr. Scanland, editor, of June 25, 1879, shows the sensation created in the remotest parishes of Louisiana by this hearing before the convention:

The ladies, it seems, are about walking up and demanding enlarged liberties. We were under the impression that women generally had about as much latitude as they wanted, but if they desire more, the *Tribune* says, in the name of gallantry if not justice, let them have all they wish. There is an element throughout the Union agitating the proposition that they are entitled to vote because they are taxed. The Constitution of the United States provides that no one shall be taxed without representation. Representation is based on population, and, of course, the ladies are enumerated; and the "horrid men" claim that the ladies are represented through them. This a great many repudiate, and their heads are about level. When a man assumes to represent a woman, he undertakes a larger contract than he imagines—something we would not dream of attempting in a political or any other sense.

The ladies who advocate female suffrage claim that as they are governed by the laws

* Of her speech Mrs. Merrick writes: "Fearing that I could not be heard, I proposed to my son-in law, Mr. Guthrie, that he should read it for me, but Mrs. Saxon objected, saying, 'No matter if they do not hear a word you say! You do not wish a man to represent you at the polls; represent yourself now, if you only stand up and move your lips.' 'I will,' said I, 'you are right.'—[EDITORS.

they have a right to a voice in making them. Many of the ablest women of this country hold that belief, and of all our noble statesmen, not one has advanced an answer to this demand—reasonable, if it does come from women. A French essayist held that as women are a part of society, they have a right to be judges of its members, assist in making its laws, and condemn and punish transgressors. They have their influence, but that is not so effective as power. * * * * Some of the brightest intellects that adorn the social circles throughout this country and State hold these views and ably advance them. Among them in this State are Mrs. E. L. Saxon, Mrs. Merrick, wife of ex-Chief-Justice Merrick, and Mrs. Dr. Harriette Keating. When our convention was discussing the suffrage question, these ladies petitioned to be heard. Of course the request was allowed. Last Tuesday evening the above-mentioned ladies addressed the congress at length. Their speeches were able, and the ideas they advanced were sound logic; but if carried into effect may prove beneficial, and may not. Woman suffrage is an experiment. Like everything else, we will never know its effects until after it is tried. We only wish that there were a few more men in that convention who could make as able speeches as did these ladies—notwithstanding the Utopian ideas advanced.

When the new constitution finally went forth, it contained, as the result of all our arguments and appeals, but one little concession:

ARTICLE 232. Women twenty-one years of age and upwards, shall be eligible to any office of control or management under the school laws of the State.

Judge I. F. Marshall of Catahoula parish, an accomplished gentleman and able lawyer, suggested this article, and it was presented and championed by Hon. F. L. Claiborne* of Pointe Coupée. The women of Louisiana have never realized any advantage from this law. All school offices are filled by appointment of the governor, and there was no serious agitation for the enforcement of this clause in the new constitution until the autumn of 1885, when, in response to the demand that women should be appointed on the school-board of New Orleans, Gov. McEnery, through a correspondent of the *Times-Democrat*, gave his opinion as follows:

If a married woman occupied an office under the school laws, in which it was necessary to bring a suit to enforce some right connected with it, she would have to get the consent of her husband to bring the suit and join him with her. There are only a few exceptional cases where the married woman can legally act independently of her husband. Our code so recognizes the paramount control of the husband that when a widow, who is the tutor of her minor children, wishes to marry, and gets the consent of a family meeting to be retained in the tutorship, the code, article 255, says: Her second husband becomes of necessity the co-tutor, and, for the administration of the property subsequently to his marriage, becomes bound *in solido* with his wife. And so it would be in the appointment of a married woman to a public office. Her husband, of necessity, would share it with her; would, in fact, be the officer. And as to unmarried women, Article 232 does not repeal any of their disabilities. It does not repeal the laws creating the essential differences between men and women. It, as I stated, simply asserts a right, and is inoperative until there is legislation to enforce it.

The *Daily Picayune* of November 16, under the head lines of "Women as Members of School Boards," "The Law and the Facts in the Case Presented by Mrs. Merrick," gives the following:

* The Claibornes are a distinguished Virginia family, but belong to the history of Mississippi and Louisiana since territorial times. Mr. Claiborne now regrets that he did not go farther, for he is satisfied that women may be trusted with powers that have long been withheld. He says he was led to reflect seriously on the subject by the able addresses of Mrs. Keating, Mrs. Saxon and Mrs. Merrick, who made a profound impression on the convention.

Last Thursday evening, November 12, a special meeting or reception was held by the women's club at their rooms on Baronne street. On this occasion the club was addressed by Mrs. Caroline E. Merrick, a good and practical-minded friend of the cause of woman. The 12th was the seventieth birthday of Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and a decorated picture of the famous woman hung in the rooms. Mrs. Merrick read a sketch of the life of Mrs. Stanton, but devoted the first part of the evening to reading the following paper, the matter of which is of the keenest interest to all thinking men and women in the State:

More than eighty thousand children attend the public schools in Louisiana, and of this number one-half are girls, and of the 389 teachers employed in the public schools of New Orleans, 368 are women. It cannot be denied that these are of equal concern and importance to the State with any like number of boys and men, nor does it require any argument to prove that mothers are best qualified to superintend and look after the welfare of their own children. In view of this fact the convention of 1879 embodied the following article in the constitution of the State:

ARTICLE 232. Women 21 years of age and upward shall be eligible to any office of control or management under the school laws of this State.

Notwithstanding the absolute right conferred by this article on women over twenty-one years of age, the chief executive of the State, with his present views, is apparently unwilling to make any appointment of women to such management without further legislation. The views of the Governor on all questions are always entitled to great respect. The question is one of interpretation, and many of the best lawyers in Louisiana do not hesitate to hold and declare a different view.

I am told that there are in the various constitutions of the States and general government two classes of provisions, the one self-executing and absolute, and the other requiring legislative action before they can be exercised. For example of the first class, article 59 of the constitution declares that "the supreme executive power of the State shall be vested in a chief magistrate, who shall be styled the Governor of Louisiana." Nobody would ever undertake to say that the governor was dependent on any more legislation to carry this into effect so as to enable him to fill his office. If he were, it would then become necessary to legislate about every other article, and so the constitution would be worthless, everything being required to be done over by the legislature before the constitution could have any effect.

Article 232 of the constitution is imperative. It declares that women over twenty-one years of age shall be eligible to any office of control or management under the school laws of the State. Can the legislature repeal or modify this mandate? Of course not. Could the absoluteness of this right be expressed in plainer or more energetic terms? No, indeed. We are told and have been made to understand that it is a right conferred by the constitution of the State, which cannot be defeated or enlarged, or even abridged in any way by the legislatnre; neither by modification, repeal, or inaction. That this article being paramount law, itself repeals all legislation inconsistent with it. The constitution, I am told, prescribes the legal and other qualifications for our judges of the courts. Nobody ever thought legislative action was needed when their qualifications are according to that instrument, to enable them to take their places on the bench.

Article 185 of the constitution prescribes the qualifications of voters or electors, and we are instructed that all conflicting laws on that point are annulled by the sovereign will of the people in convention assembled. In fact, good lawyers have given us innumerable examples, illustrations and decisions to this effect; and even women, who are for the most part ignorant of the laws of their State, begin to understand that they have a right to a place on the school-board for some one of their own sex here in Louisiana. True, it has been said that there are other articles which are in conflict with article 232, but we are told the other provisions of the constitution relate to other and more general subjects, and on this very subject the framers of the constitution have in very positive and unmistakable terms declared its precise will, and it is wasting time to try to explain it away. These wise jurists do not fear to tell us further, that special

Digitized by Google

laws or provisions in a constitution or statute abrogate or limit the general provisions in the same instrument.

We are sorry that our governor apprehends any difficulty would arise in regard to married women being school directors. He says the husband might change his domicile and the wife would be obliged to follow him, and if bond were required she could not sign it without his consent, and finally the fact was she could not do *anything* without the husband's consent. Then "the husband would share the office with her." I have heard that it was difficult to prevent outside influences from operating upon the minds of men in office. We have certainly heard some complaints of this sort, but it seems that there would be no great danger encountered from this source. The duties which this article of the constitution permits women to perform are not generally remunerative, and would be probably more a labor of love than of reward. As to the other objections, perhaps the husband *would* sign his wife's bond, and perhaps he would *not* move away while she held the office. I have heard that sheriffs sometimes run away after giving bond, and people are sometimes elected to office and unable to qualify, and others disappoint the public by resigning. Moreover we have ascertained the fact that a tutrix may subsequently marry, and that act does not prevent her from filling the office of tutrix, neither does the fact of being already married prevent her from discharging the duties of tutrix. But I see no harm done if the husband should become the assistant of his wife in this office. Is it not manifest that the two together would have a superior official knowledge of the needs and exigencies of the girls sent to the public schools and the women who teach them daily, than the husband could possibly attain by himself? But the whole difficulty, it seems to us, might be obviated. Let the governor appoint unmarried women. A woman who has been so unfortunate as to be a widow would not be objectionable.

The article says: "Women over twenty-one years shall be eligible" to these offices. It does not say the legislature may make them "eligible." By its own inherent force it declares them eligible. If they are really eligible, then why not have them selected and appointed? They have every requisite for the office, and as the dictionary says, are "proper to be chosen." They are "qualified to be elected." They are "legally qualified." They are eligible. It is not at all likely that the legislature will ever do the vain thing of affirming a constitutional right so explicitly given.

The opposition of the executive, therefore, seems to be a bar not only to this provision being carried out, but also to the raising of any question under it for the consideration of the judiciary. It is confidently hoped and expected that he will consent to reconsider the whole question. We feel sure the governor will not intentionally be guilty of any injustice to the women of Louisiana, and will not desire to withhold any benefit from them which has already been conferred by the State constitution. Women all over the Union rejoiced when this generous concession was granted here in Louisiana. In many other States they enjoy the same, and greater privileges, and letters and inquiries have come from distant States, asking why this law has not gone into effect. We are aware that any reform changing existing conditions must move slowly, and is apt to be unpopular with men in authority; then it also antagonizes the inertia of women, who are too modest to thrust themselves forward, saying, "I am ready to serve the State"; yet they know all the time they can do good service in relation to the schools. Only give them a kindly helping hand, and we feel sure that a valuable coöperating influence will be felt, of which no one has ever dreamed in the past. We leave this matter to the governor, to the citizens of Louisiana, and to the fathers who take a deep interest in the welfare of their daughters as well as of their sons.

Our legislature passed a law requiring physiology to be taught in the public schools, while the vast majority of the teachers of the State are women, and no college in which that science is taught is open to them. In 1885, Dr Chaillé gave a course of free lectures on physiology and anatomy for the benefit of the New Orleans teachers, who, while they are doing

Digitized by Google

the most important public work in training the rising generation in the rudiments of learning, are denied the advantages of the higher education that would fit them for the duties of their profession. A fitting precedent for the action of our rulers may be found in Shakespeare's, "Titus Andronicus," in which rude men seize the king's daughter, cut out her tongue and cut off her hands, and then bid her go call for water and wash her hands.

The State Pharmaceutical Association, formed in 1882 with 110 members, unanimously elected Miss Eliza Rudolph a member. Miss Rudolph was then the only woman in the drug business. Having been refused admission to the medical college of the State University, she perfected herself in pharmacy by a course of private lectures. In 1884 she was elected corresponding secretary of the association.

The *Daily Picayune*, in closing its half-century, gives the following of Mrs. E. J. Nicholson, its chief owner and manager since January, 1876:

"Pearl Rivers," the lady's *nom de plume*, was already well known in the republic of letters before she became, as she now is, the most eminent female journalist in the world, largely owning and successfully directing for years a great daily political journal. The fact is unique. The fame of Mrs. Nicholson belongs to the world of letters and her biography may be found in any dictionary of Southern authors, nevertheless a history of the *Picayune* would not be complete without some notice of one who has had so much to do with its destiny. Miss Eliza J. Poltevent is a native of Hancock county, Mississippi. She was born on the banks of one of the most beautiful streams in the South, Pearl river. She wrote over the name of "Pearl Rivers," and her poems made her a conspicuous niche in the temple of Southern letters. She wrote much for the *Picayune* and wrote herself into love as well as fame. She was married to Col. Holbrook, the proprietor of the paper, and after his death in 1876, she succeeded to the ownership. This was a trying position for a woman. The South had not recovered from the devastation of the war, and the *Picayune* was involved in embarrassments. Friends even advised her to dispose of the property and not to undertake so formidable a task as the conduct of a daily paper under existing complications. Brave and true-hearted, with a profound and abiding conviction of her duty in the matter, she assumed the control of the paper. She wisely surrounded herself with able and devoted assistants, and with their help has gallantly and successfully surmounted many formidable obstacles, until she has seen the *Picayune* reëstablished on a sound and prosperous basis. Mr. George Nicholson had acquired a proprietorship in it, and when Mrs. Holbrook assumed control the firm name was E. J. Holbrook & Co. On June 28, 1878, the interests of the two copartners were further consolidated by marriage. Since then the *Picayune* has been published under the firm name of Nicholson & Co., and the columns daily attest the energy, enterprise and ability with which it is conducted, while its advertising patronage speaks for itself.

Mrs. Martha R. Field is a member of the editorial staff of the *Picayune*. She has charge of the Sunday woman's column, besides her regular column over the *nom de plume* of Catherine Cole.

The *Times-Democrat* is owned by Mrs. Burke, who however leaves its management to her husband, Col. Burke. Miss Bessie Bisland, under the name of B. L. R. Dane, contributes to the Sunday paper, and edits the "*Bric-a-Brac* column" which consists of criticisms and reviews of the leading magazines. This paper boasts the most clever "Society column" in the country; it is edited by Mrs. Jennie Coldwell Nixon who is now, 1886, superintendent of the Woman's Department of the Exposition.

Mrs. J. Pinkney Smith edits the "Social Melange" of the *States*. Among the regular Sunday contributors are Miss Corrinne Castillanos, who buzzes as the Society Bee, and Mrs. Mollie Moore Davis, known as the "Texas Song Bird." Mrs. Ada Hilderbrand, editor of the *Courier* at Gretna, did the printing for the Woman's Exposition.

New Orleans has a Woman's National Press Association of which Mrs. E. J. Nicholson is president; a Christian Woman's Exchange, Mrs. R. M. Wamsley, president, doing a business of $45,000 a year,* a Southern Art Union and Woman's Industrial Association, with Mrs. J. H. Stauffer and others on the auxiliary executive committee, and a Woman's Club,† originated by Miss Bessie Bisland who was the president of the club for the first year, 1885.

The laws of Louisiana relating to women have been given by Judge E. T. Merrick, a well-known legal authority and for ten years the chief-justice of the Supreme Court of the State:

The rights of married women to their estates are probably better secured in Louisiana than in any other of these United States. The laws on this subject are derived from Spain. Certain provinces of that kingdom were conquered and for centuries held by the Visigoths, among whom, as among the Franks at Paris, the institution called the community of aquets and gains between husband and wife, prevailed. In Spain, as in France, there were certain provinces in which the ancient Roman law continued in force, and they were called the provinces of the written law. In these (called also the countries of the *dotal regime*) there was no community between the spouses of their acquisitions. Both of these systems are recognized by the Louisiana civil code, but if the parties marry without any marriage settlement the law implies that they have married under the *regime* of the community. To prevent error it is proper to observe that there have been three civil codes adopted in Louisiana, viz., in 1808, 1825 and 1870. The marriage laws are substantially the same in all, but bear different numbers in each code. The following references are to the code of 1870. Except in a very limited number of cases the husband and wife are incapable of making binding contracts with each other during the marriage. Hence all settlements of property, to be binding, must be executed before marriage and in solemn form, that is, before a notary and two male witnesses having the proper qualifications. The betrothed are granted considerable liberty over the provisions of their marriage contract, as the following quotations show:

ART. 2,325. In relation to property, the law only regulates the conjugal association in default of particular agreements, which the parties are at liberty to stipulate as they please, provided they be not contrary to good morals and under the modifications hereafter prescribed.

ART. 2,326. Husband and wife can in no case enter into any agreement or make any renunciation the object of which would be to alter the legal order of descents, either with respect to themselves, in what concerns the inheritance of their children,

---

* The officers of the Christian Woman's Exchange for 1885, were: *President*, Mrs. R. M. Walmsley; *Vice-Presidents*, Mesdames T. G. Richardson, M. W. Bartlett, Albert Baldwin, John R. Juden, J. H. Allen; *Recording Secretary*, Mrs. Theo. Auze; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. E. J. Wharton; *Treasurer*, Mrs. S. H. Davis; *Acting Treasurer*, Mrs. F. N. Griswold; *Board of Managers*, Mesdames S. Landrum, M. C. Jennings, B. D. Wood, A. Brittin, Percy Roberts, S. Delgado, F. N. Griswold, E. L. Wood, Wm. Muller, E. Ranlett, G. W. Pritchard, L. P. Wayne, T. H. Holmes, J. B. Wallace, Albert Baldwin, P. N. Strong, K. Fuhri, S. H. Kennedy, H. J. Leovy, John Parker, R. M. Walmsley, T. G. Richardson, Theo. Auze, E. J. Wharton, S. H. Davis, M. W. Bartlett, D. A. Given, John R. Juden, J. H. Allen, Fred. Wing.

† The original members of the Woman's Club were: Miss Bessie Bisland, Mrs. Elizabeth W. Baker, Miss C. Farrar, Mrs. J. M. Ferguson, Miss M. E. Hagan, Miss J. E. Linsler, Miss H. D. Pickens, Miss M. Siebold, Mrs. M. J. C. Swayze, Miss E. Schrieves, Miss M. Manning, Miss P. Teil-tebaum.

posterity, or with respect to their children between themselves, without prejudice to the donations *inter vivas* or *mortis causa*, which may take place according to the formalities and in the cases determined by this code.

The parties are also "prohibited from derogating from the power of the husband over the person of his wife and children which belongs to the husband as the head of the family, or from the rights guaranteed to the surviving husband or wife" (C. C., Art. 2,327).

If the parties adopt the *dotal regime* in their marriage contract the dotal effects are (except under some circumstances) inalienable during marriage; and at the dissolution of the marriage, they are to be replaced or returned to the wife, or her heirs, and to secure this, the wife has a mortgage on her husband's lands, and a privilege on his movables, including those of the community (C. C., Art. 2376; Art. 2347). "The dower is given to the husband, for him to enjoy the same as long as the marriage shall last." Strong as is this language, the dowry is given by the wife or her father or mother or other relations or friends, simply to support the marriage.

Under the *regime* of the community, the individual property of the husband or wife, and all property either may acquire afterwards by inheritance or donations remain separate property. The conjugal partnership is defined by C. C., Art. 2402. "This partnership, or community, consists of the profits of all the effects of which the husband has the administration and enjoyment, either of right or in fact, of the produce of the reciprocal industry and labor of both husband and wife, and the estates which they may acquire during marriage, either by donations made jointly to them both, or by purchase, or in any other similar way, even should the purchase be in the name of one of the two, and not of both, because in that case the period of time when the purchase is made is alone attended to, and not the person who made the purchase."

During the marriage the husband has the management of the community, and he can sell or exchange the same, but he cannot give away the real estate without binding his estate to recompense the wife or her heirs, for the one-half so given away. All the income of his estate must enter into the community. On the other hand the wife may at her pleasure take her own estate from the management of the husband into her own control and discretion (C. C. 2384). But in this contingency she must contribute to the family expenses (C. C. 2389 and 2435).

If the affairs of the husband become embarrassed, the wife can sue the husband for a separation of property, and get a judgment against him for all indebtedness, on account of money or property used or disposed of by him, and sell him out under execution, and buy in the property herself if she sees fit. Thus she stands in a more favorable position toward the community than the husband, who is bound for all its debts, for she can stand by and choose. If the community becomes prosperous, she has the absolute right, as owner, to one-half of it after payment of debts, and a right to the income of the other half until she dies, or marries a second time.

By causing her claims on account of her separate or paraphernal estate to be recorded, she secures a mortgage against her husband's lands and the lands of the community. If a husband or wife dies affluent, leaving the survivor in necessitous circumstances, the latter can claim one-fourth of the estate of the deceased. This is called "the marital fourth." The wife, also, if she or the children do not possess one thousand dollars in their own right, can claim as a privilege and against the creditors, one thousand dollars, or a sum which, with her own estate, shall equal that amount.

The wife cannot appear in court, or dispose of, or mortgage, or acquire real estate, without the consent of the husband, but the judge of the court of the domicil may authorize the wife to sue, or be sued. If the husband refuses to empower the wife to contract, she may cite him into court and have the property of the proposed contract settled by an order of the judge. The wife has full power to make a will without any authorization from her husband or the court.

ART. 2,398. The wife, whether separated in property, by contract, or by judgment, or not separated, cannot bind herself for her husband, nor conjointly with him, for debts contracted by him before or during the marriage.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 0 4 L

Caroline E. Merrick

and wife owe to each other mutual fidelity, support and as-

d to live with her husband, and follow him wherever he
obliged to receive her, and furnish her with whatever
fe in proportion to his means and condition.

anting divorces of such marriages as have been
State so that the courts of Louisiana may
tted in foreign countries. For abandon-
e granted until one year after a decree
hout a reconciliation. In other par-

Delta had this item:
n court in this city;
el in the courts."
ed on a suit for
ver property
nd delays,
ivacity
ight,
er

Caroline E. Merrick

Digitized by Google

ART. 119. The husband and wife owe to each other mutual fidelity, support and assistance.

ART. 120. The wife is bound to live with her husband, and follow him wherever he chooses to reside; the husband is obliged to receive her, and furnish her with whatever is required for the convenience of life in proportion to his means and condition.

It is provided that the domicil for granting divorces of such marriages as have been solemnized in Louisiana, shall be in that State so that the courts of Louisiana may grant divorces for causes and faults committed in foreign countries. For abandonment and other causes, a final divorce cannot be granted until one year after a decree of separation from bed and board has elapsed without a reconciliation. In other particulars the law is similar to that of the other States.

One day in 1842, the New Orleans *Delta* had this item: "Myra Clark Gaines argued her own case in court in this city; the only instance of a lady appearing as counsel in the courts." Mrs. Gaines was a remarkable woman. She carried on a suit for many years against the city of New Orleans to recover property that belonged to her, and, through untold difficulties and delays, triumphed at last. She preserved her youth, beauty and vivacity until late in life. All who knew her can readily recall her bright, sparkling face, and wonderful powers of conversation. In her long experience in litigation, she became well versed in the laws regarding real estate and the right of descent. Mrs. Gaines was a generous woman and did not desire to rob the poor; to many such she gave a quit-claim title to the property which she had secured under her suits.

In 1869, the New Orleans *Republican* had an excellent editorial fully endorsing the demand for woman's enfranchisement. In 1870 the *Livingston Herald*, published in Ponchatoula parish, by J. O. and J. E. Spencer, advocated suffrage for women.

In 1874, the secretary of the treasury rendered a decision that when a woman owns a steamboat she may be named in the papers as the master of the same. This decision, despite the opposition of Solicitor Raynor, received confirmation in case of Mrs. Miller, in 1883, from Secretary Charles J. Folger.

II.—TEXAS.

In the adoption of the first constitution of Texas, woman had some representatives in the convention to remind the legislators of that State of her existence, and to demand that the constitution be so framed as to secure the right of suffrage alike to both sexes. On the resolution of Mr. Mundine, to extend suffrage to women, in the constitutional convention of Texas, January, 1869, Hon. L. D. Evans said:

I do not favor the adoption of this measure at the present time, because the country is not yet prepared, yet it is entitled to our respectful consideration—therefore I thank the convention for allowing me the opportunity to state the ground on which the friends of woman suffrage place their advocacy, so far as I may be able under the five-minute rule. It does not comport with the dignity of a representative body engaged in forming a constitution of government to thrust aside the claim of woman to the right of suffrage,—a claim that is advocated by some of the ablest statesmen and political philosophers of Europe and America, and is destined to a sure and speedy triumph.

Aristotle, the profoundest thinker of antiquity, in his treatise on politics, defines a citizen to be "one who enjoys a due share in the government of that country of which he is a member." If he does not enjoy this right, then he is no citizen, but a subject. Every citizen, therefore, is entitled to a voice—a vote—a due share in the government of his country. I am aware that the courts and politicians in democratic America have not so defined citizenship. The reason is that politics is not yet a positive science, and they have failed to analyze this question. Had they a clear conception of the constituent elements—the anatomy, so to speak, of the body politic, they would perceive that suffrage—a voice in the government—is an essential condition of citizenship. Aristotle, in his treatise, which is perhaps the ablest yet given to the world, pointed out that families, not individuals, are the constituent units of a State.

A family—a household—exists and is held together by natural laws, independent of the State, and an aggregation of these constitute the State. The head of the family, whoever that may be, according to its structure, is the representative in the State. All the constituent members of the family, consisting, in its most perfect form, of husband, wife, children and domestics, are subject to the authority of the head, and have no voice, no vote, no share in the government, except through their head or representative. In societies where the common law obtains, which in this respect is a transcript of the Bible, the wife, like the child, is subordinated to the authority of the husband, and on principle, has no voice, no vote. On the decease of the husband, the widow becomes the head of the family, and on principle is entitled to a voice, a vote. But in countries where the civil law governs, the wife is the partner, and not the subject of her husband, and on principle ought to have her due share in the government.

When the children in a family, whether male or female, attain the age fixed by law for the control of their own affairs, and do control them, they are free, independent, and on every principle are entitled to a due share in the government—to a vote. Every member of society who is free and independent—capable of managing his own affairs, or making his own living, and does make it, should have the same right of choice in the selection of his political agents that he has to select his legal or business agents. But all persons, no matter from what cause, who are unable to maintain themselves, and are dependent for their support upon others, are incapable of any share in the government, and should have no voice—no vote. As soon as the principle of citizenship comes to be thoroughly understood, woman suffrage must be adopted throughout the United States, in England, and in every country where representative government exists.

The Revolution of August 20, 1868, said:

We have received from Loring P. Haskins, esq., a delegate to the convention, the following excellent report and declaration made and signed by a majority of the committee to whom the subject of woman suffrage was referred. We need scarcely bespeak attentive reading:

Report of the Committee on State Affairs upon Female Suffrage, with accompanying Declaration:

July 30, 1868—Introduced and ordered to be printed.

COMMITTEE ROOM, AUSTIN, Texas, July 10, 1868.

To the Hon. E. J. Davis, President of the Convention:

A majority of your Committee on State Affairs, to whom was referred the declara-

Digitized by Google

tion introduced by the Hon. T. H. Mundine of the county of Burleson, to extend the right of suffrage to all citizens of the State over the age of twenty-one years, possessing the requisite qualifications for electors, have examined with much care said declaration and considered the object sought to be accomplished, and have arrived at the conclusion that said declaration ought to be a part of the organic law.

It was said by George Washington that the safety of republican government depends upon the virtue and intelligence of the people. This declaration is not a new theory of government for the first time proposed to be made a part of our republican institutions. The idea of extending the elective franchise to females has been discussed both in Great Britain and in the United States. Your committee are of the opinion that the true base of republican government must ever be the wisdom and virtue of the people.

In this State our system of jurisprudence is a combination of civil and Spanish law, intermixed with the common law of England; and this peculiar system, just in all its parts for the preservation of the rights of married and unmarried women, is likely to be continued. The time was when woman was regarded as the mere slave of man. It was believed, in order to perpetuate the pretended divine right of kings to rule, that the mass of the people should be kept in profound ignorance and that woman was not entitled to the benefits of learning at all. It is not remarkable that as the benign principles of Christianity have been promulgated, free government has steadily progressed and the divine rights of woman have been recognized.

The old constitution of the republic of Texas, the constitution of the State of Texas of 1845, the laws enacted for the protection of married women, the many learned decisions of the Supreme Courts of Texas and Louisiana, and other courts, clearly indicate that the march of intelligence is onward and that our advanced civilization has approximated to the period when other and more sacred rights are to be conceded. Is it just that woman, who bears her reasonable portion of the burdens of government, should be denied the right of aiding in the enactment of its laws?

The question of extending the freedom of the ballot to woman may well claim the attention of the law-maker, and in view of the importance of the subject a majority of your committee earnestly recommend the passage of the declaration.

H. C. HUNT, *Chairman*,

T. H. MUNDINE, BENJ. WATROUS,
WM. H. FLEMING, L. P. HARRIS.

A DECLARATION.

Be it declared by the people of Texas in convention assembled, that the following shall be a section of the constitution of the State of Texas, known as section —— of article ——: Every person, without distinction of sex, who shall have arrived at the age of twenty-one years, and who shall be a citizen of the United States, or is at the time of the adoption of this constitution by the congress of the United States a citizen of the State of Texas, and shall have resided in this State one year next preceding an election, and the last six months within the district, county, city or town in which he or she offers to vote, shall be an elector.

The *Woman's Journal* of December 4, 1875, contains a letter from Mrs. Sarah W. Hiatt, who presented a memorial to the constitutional convention. The memorial was referred to the Committee on Suffrage. In regard to the effect, she says:

Since the presentation of the memorial I have had some very interesting letters on the subject from a few of our leading men; some for, others against woman suffrage, but all treating the subject respectfully. I copy below a portion of one just received. I should like to give it entire with the writer's name, but have not his permission to do so:

Digitized by Google

As you apprehended, the question of suffrage had been definitely settled in the convention before the reception of your letter. It remains as heretofore, unrestricted manhood suffrage. That all the rabble, the very *débris* of society, should be allowed a voice in government, and yet intelligent, highly-cultivated women who are amenable to the laws of the State and who own and pay taxes on property, should be debarred from a voice in making the laws which are to affect their persons and property equally with that of the men, is to my mind simply an outrage on reason and justice. * * * The fear of ignoring the right of petition, and gallantry towards your sex on the part of a few, prevented the memorial from being summarily rejected. Outside of ——— and ——— I know of no member of the convention who openly favors woman suffrage in any form. It is true there are a number of gentlemen who, in private conversation, will admit the justice of your plea, but avoid it by saying that ladies generally neither demand nor desire the right to vote. The truth is, these men (and society is full of them) have not the moral courage to do simple justice.

Thus you see that, so far as the action of this convention is concerned, our cause is defeated. Yet I do not feel discouraged. I think there is hardly a State in the Union that has such just and excellent laws concerning the property rights of women as Texas. There is also great liberality of sentiment here concerning the avocations of women. But the right of women to the ballot seems to be almost a new idea to our people. I have never lived in a community where the women are more nearly abreast of the men in all the activities of life than here in this frontier settlement. In our State a woman's property, real or personal, is her own, to keep, to convey, or to bequeath. The unusual number of widows here, due to the incursions of the Indians during and since the war, has made the management as well as the ownership of property by women so common a thing as to attract no notice. I might give interesting instances, but that would take time, and my point is this, that the laws which have enabled, and the circumstances which have driven women to rely upon and to exert themselves, have been educational, not only to them, but also to the community. The importance of this education to the future—who can measure it? It is true that many of them can neither read nor write, but in this the men are not in advance of them. It as often happens that the woman can read while the man cannot, as the reverse. And they are almost universally resolved that their children shall not grow up in the ignorance that has been their portion. If the women could vote, our convention would not think of submitting a constitution that did not secure to the State a liberal free school system.

The legislature of 1885, after a hard struggle, enacted a law making it compulsory on the heads of all departments to give at least one-half of the clerical positions in their respective offices to women. The action has extraordinary interest, and is regarded as a victory for the woman's rights party. Mrs. Jenny Bland Beauchamp of Dennison writes:

Texas claims to be a woman's State, in that her laws are unusually just and lenient to women. A woman who has property at marriage can keep it. She can even claim any property that she can prove was bought with

that money. The wife is entitled to half the community whether she owned any of the original stock or not. She has a life interest in the homestead; no deed of trust can be put upon it, nor can it be mortgaged. It can only be conveyed from her by actual sale with her written consent. Under our latest revised statutes women have the right of suffrage, but have never exercised it; nor is the subject agitated to any great extent.

Three years ago, when the State University was built, it was decided that it should be coëducational, and young women are now being educated there side by side with young men. Texas has many liberal men and women. It is generally remarked that the women of the State are better educated than the men.

Miss Julia Pease, a Vassar graduate and daughter of the late ex-Governor Pease, has charge of 6,000 acres of land. She lives in the family mansion at Austin with her mother, and in addition to her other duties superintends the education of the three children of her deceased sisters.

Mrs. Rogers, the "cattle queen" of Texas, inherited from her first husband a herd of 40,000 cattle. The widow managed the business, and in due time married a preacher twenty years younger than herself, who had seven children. She attends to her estate herself, rides among her cowboys on horseback, and can tell just what a steer or cow is worth at any size or age.

The largest individual sheep-owner is a woman, known all over the State as the "Widow Cullahan." Her sheep, more than 50,000 in number, wander over the ranges of Uvalda and Bandern counties, in the southwestern part of the State. Their grade is a cross between the hardy Mexican sheep and the Vermont merino. They are divided into flocks of 2,000 head each, with a "bossero" and two "pastoras" in charge of each flock. At the spring and fall shearings long trains of wagons transport the "widow's" wool to the market at San Antonio.

Texas has two female dentists. Mrs. Stocking is one of the most successful dental surgeons in the State. The other, Miss Emma Tibler, went from Kentucky to Texas for the purpose of teaching. Finding this profession full, she studied dentistry and is now a successful practitioner of Cleburne.

The youngest telegrapher in the world is probably Hattie Hutchinson, in charge of an office in Texas. She is only ten years old.

III.—Arkansas.

Under date of March, 1868, Miles L. Langley writes from Arkadelphia, Arkansas, in regard to the efforts for equality in the constitutional convention:

Arkadelphia, Ark., March 5, 1868.

Susan B. Anthony—*Dear Friend:* With a sad heart but an approving conscience, I will give you some information relative to the action of our constitutional convention on the franchise question.

The new constitution—a copy of which I send you—makes no difference between men, on account of race or color and contains other excellences; but alas! it fails to guarantee to woman her God-given and well-earned rights of civil and political equality.

I made a motion to insert in the constitution a section to read thus: "All citizens twenty-one years of age, who can read and write the English language, shall be eligible to the elective franchise, and be entitled to equal political and legal rights and privileges." The motion was seconded

and I had the floor, but the House became so clamorous that the president could not restore order, and the meeting adjourned with the understanding that I was to occupy the floor next morning. But next morning, just as I was about to commence my speech, some of the members tried to "bully" me out of the right to speak on that question. I replied that I had been robbed, shot, and imprisoned for advocating the rights of the slaves, and that I would then and there speak in favor of the rights of women if I had to fight for the right! I then proceeded to present arguments of which I am not ashamed. I was met with ridicule, sarcasm and insult. My ablest opponent, a lawyer, acknowledged in his reply that he could not meet my argument. The motion was laid on the table.

The Democrats are my enemies because I assisted in emancipating the slaves. The Republicans have now become my opponents, because I have made an effort to confer on the women their rights. And even the women themselves fail to sympathize with me.

Very respectfully, MILES L. LANGLEY.

The Arkansas *Ladies' Journal* says:

> They tell us that women are not fit for politics. This may be true; and as it is next to impossible to change the nature of a woman, why wouldn't it be a good idea to so change politics that it shall be fit for women?

In 1885, Arkansas formed its first woman suffrage society at Eureka Springs through the efforts of Miss Phœbe Couzins, Mrs. Lizzie D. Fyler, president. The association numbers some fine speakers. The press is not in opposition, one or two papers favor the cause.

Misses Pettigrew and Sims have been elected clerks of the legislature. Several other ladies were candidates for the positions, and the contest was quite exciting. Mrs. Simonson and Miss Emily Thomas are members of the board of directors of a lumber company at Batesville, and Miss Thomas is also bookkeeper of the firm.

A very able report * of what has been done in Arkansas for the elevation of woman was presented by Mrs. Lizzie D. Fyler at the annual Washington convention in March, 1884.

IV.—MISSISSIPPI.

Mississippi secures to a married woman her own separate estate, and enables her to contract with her husband, or others, and carry on business in her own name. She may sue her husband, or others, and be sued, and has practically most of her civil rights; but her political rights are denied as in all other States.

In 1877 a law was passed by which henceforth no one can legally sell liquor in Mississippi unless he can obtain the written consent of a majority of the adult citizens of both sexes resident in the township.

The Mississippi Industrial College for Women held its formal opening October 22, 1885, at Columbus. Students had come from all parts of the State. More than 300 had already entered. The occasion was a brilliant

* See Report Washington Convention, 1884.

Digitized by Google

one. Speeches were made by Senator E. T. Sykes, Senator J. McMartin of Claiborne county, Col. J. L. Power of Jackson, Hon. James T. Harrison, Governor Lowry, and Dr. Jones. Mrs. E. G. Peyton of Hazelhurst, to whose efforts the founding of the Industrial College is largely due, was called upon, and in a few well-chosen remarks expressed the pride she felt in the State and in the college, feeling sure, she said, that Mississippi's daughters were now in safe hands.

Miss Lilian Light, the eight-year-old daughter of Mr. Jere Light of Hayneville, when only five or six years old began to make figures in clay, and now (1885) has a large collection of mud cats, hogs, dogs, cows, horses, and men. The figures are declared to be not childish imitations, but remarkably acute likenesses. Her best piece represents a negro praying, and is said to be very clever.

Miss C. F. Boardman of Elmore's Point, two miles from Biloxi, on the Bock Bay, has received the chief premiums awarded for oranges grown on the Gulf coast outside of Florida. This lady has 1,000 bearing orange trees of the choicest varieties, and has devoted her attention to the production of these and other tropical fruits, with great success. She came to the South for health a few years ago, and has not only found that, but has established for herself a pleasing and profitable industry in fruit culture. Her oranges were exhibited among numerous fine competing specimens, and were chosen for high excellence.

Miss Eliza A. Dupuy for many years contributed copiously to Mr. Bonner's *Ledger*. Miss Dupuy, who was descended from prominent Virginia families, was in her youth a teacher. The first story written by her was produced when she was only fourteen years old. More fortunate than the majority of authors, she leaves behind her a considerable sum earned by her ever-busy pen.

Mrs. Sarah A. Dorsey was perhaps the most remarkable woman that Mississippi can boast. She was the niece of Mrs. Warfield, the author of the "Household of Bouverie," who had great influence in forming her literary tastes. The New Orleans Monthly *Review* contains many able articles on abstruse questions from her pen. One, in the February number for 1876, on the "Origin of the Species," is exceptionally able and interesting. It was read in October, 1875, before the New Orleans Academy of Sciences by Mrs. Dorsey herself. This article shows extensive reading in scientific questions. She was made corresponding member of the Academy, an honor she appreciated more highly for her sex than for herself. She was a large-souled, noble woman, devoted to what she considered Southern interests. She bequeathed to Jefferson Davis the estate, called Beauvoir, on which he now resides.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LV. (CONTINUED).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MARYLAND—DELAWARE—KENTUCKY—TENNESSEE—VIRGINIA—WEST VIRGINIA—NORTH CAROLINA—SOUTH CAROLINA—FLORIDA—ALABAMA—GEORGIA.

Secretary Chase—Women in the Government Departments—Myrtilla Miner—Mrs. O'Connor's Tribute—District of Columbia Suffrage Bill—The Universal Franchise Association, 1867—Bill for a Prohibitory Law Presented by Hon. S. C. Pomeroy, 1869—A Bill for Equal Wages for the Women in the Departments, Introduced by Hon. S. M. Arnell, 1870—In 1871 Congress Passed the Organic Act for the District Confining the Right of Suffrage to Males—In 1875 it Withdrew all Legislative Power from the People—Women in Law, Medicine, Journalism and the Charities—Dental College Opened to Women—Mary A. Stuart—The Clay Sisters—The School of Pharmacy—Elizabeth Avery Meriwether—Judge Underwood—Mary Bayard Clarke—Dr. Susan Dimock—Governor Chamberlain—Coffee-Growing—Priscilla Holmes Drake—Alexander H. Stephens.

I.—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

THE District covers an area of 64 square miles, and contains a population of 200,000. It was origininally a portion of Maryland, and was ceded to congress by that State for the exclusive use of the Federal government. Hon. Salmon P. Chase, secretary of the treasury under Abraham Lincoln, seeing that most of the gifted young men had been drafted or had enlisted in the army, introduced young women as clerks in the government departments. The experiment proved successful, and now there are about six thousand women in the various departments. Mr. Chase often alluded to this afterwards as one of the most important acts of his life. The war brought many bright, earnest women to Washington, led thither by patriotism, ambition, or the necessity of finding some new employment. This new vital force, this purer element, infused into the society at the capitol, has been slowly introducing more liberal ideas into that community.

The first specific work for woman in the District of Columbia of which we find any record was that of Myrtilla Miner of New York, who opened a Normal School for colored girls, December 3, 1851. She began with six pupils in a small room in a private

house, but soon had more offered than could be accommodated. Through much ridicule and untold difficulties she struggled alone, but successfully, for ten years, when Miss Emily Howland came to her aid. The heroism of this noble woman has been told by Mrs. Ellen O. Connor in a little volume * which is a beautiful tribute to the memory of Miss Miner. The Miner Normal School of Washington is now a thorough and popular school for colored girls.

For a brief report of what has been accomplished in the District of Columbia, we are indebted to Belva A. Lockwood:

In 1866, the women of Washington were first aroused to the consideration of the suffrage question, by the discussion of "The District of Columbia suffrage bill" proposing to strike out the word "white" in order to extend the franchise to colored men. Mr. Cowan, a Democrat from Pennsylvania, offered an amendment to strike out the word "male" also, and thus enfranchise the women of the District. It was said his proposition was not made in good faith, but simply to embarrass Republican legislation. However it served a good purpose for all disfranchised classes, as the amendment called out a notable debate,† lasting three days, and received the votes of nine influential senators in its favor. The voting of the newly enfranchised negroes at the May election, 1867, brought out in strong color the beauties of masculine legislation, and immediately after there was a movement among the friends of woman's enfranchisement. A meeting was called by James and Julia Holmes at their residence, where the "Universal Franchise Association" was organized.‡ As soon as their meetings, regularly held, took on a serious air, the combined power of the press was brought to bear upon them with the determination to break them up. But the meetings were continued, notwithstanding the opposition; and although most of the speeches were good, they were often interrupted with hisses and yells, and the police, when appealed to, failed to keep order, seeming rather to join hands with the mob. In order to put a check on the rabble, contrary to the spirit of the society, a fee was charged at the door. Strangely enough, so great had the interest become, the crowd increased instead of lessening, and night after night Union League Hall was crowded, until the coffers of the association contained nearly $1,000. The press of the city in the meantime had kept up a fusilade of ludicrous reports, in which the women were caricatured and misrepresented, all of which they bore with fortitude, and without any attempt at reply. The meetings continued through the year notwithstanding the cry of the timid that the cause was being injured and fair reputations blighted.

* Myrtilla Miner; published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York.

† See Vol. II., page 90.

‡ *President*, Hon. Samuel C. Pomeroy; *Vice-Presidents*, Josophine S. Griffing, Belva A. Lockwood, Jas. H. Holmes, John H. Craney; *Advisory Council*, Mary E. O'Connor, Josephine S. Griffing, Caroline B. Winslow, Dr. Susan A. Edson, Lydia S. Hall, Mr. and Mrs. Boyle, Caroline B. Colby, and others.

Digitized by Google

June 25, 1868, a deputation from the District Franchise Association appeared, by appointment, before the House Committee of the District, to urge the passage of the bill presented in the House of Representatives by Hon. Henry D. Washburn, accompanied by a petition signed by eighty women of the District:

"Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act, no person shall be debarred from voting or holding office in the District of Columbia by reason of sex."

Mrs. Josephine S. Griffing began by saying that the friends of equal freedom for women in the District had thought the revision of the local government a fit time to present their claims and submit a memorial, setting forth the justice of passing the bill before the committee to remove the restrictions that forbid women to vote in the District. The movement was not wholly new, and was known by those active in the work to be approved by a large mass of women who were not prepared to express themselves openly. The enfranchisement of woman is needful to a real reconstruction.

Mr. Wilcox read a memorial, signed by a committee of residents of the district, consisting of eleven ladies and eleven gentlemen, including Mrs. Griffing, Mrs. E. D. E. N. Southworth, Miss Lydia S. Hall (formerly of Kansas), Mrs. Annie Denton Cridge, Judge A. B. Olin and Mrs. Olin, recalling the fact that congress had freed 3,000 slaves, and enfranchised the 8,000 colored men of the district, both of which experiments had worked well, notwithstanding conservative predictions to the contrary; and showing that, while the former experiments, on a small scale comparatively, had yielded rich results, so the enfranchisement of half the adult population would produce vast good. He incidentally answered the usual arguments against suffrage, and affirmed that those who possess neither the power of wealth nor of knowledge wherewith to protect themselves, most need political power for that purpose. He remarked that the competition for votes among politicians was a tremendous educating force, and that laws would not be certain of enforcement unless those for whose benefit they were made were clothed with power to compel such enforcement.

Mrs. Mary T. Corner presented a number of points as to the laws of the district relating to women, of some of which Judge Welker took notes with a view to their speedy investigation by the committee. As to suffrage, she pointed out that women do not come under the head of paupers, minors, felons, rebels, idiots or aliens, and that the reasons existing for the disfranchisement of such persons do not apply to native-born, loyal women. She showed that women are not represented in the government of the district, though taxed by it, and by law cannot properly protect themselves, their children, or their property, nor hold municipal office, however fit. A wife cannot hold property in the district except by proxy. Women understand their needs and condition better than men, and should be free to regulate them. The swarms of foreigners who are freely admitted to the polls know less of our institutions than the masses of our women. Women have voted and held the highest offices in other countries with great success. Are our women less capable than these? At the conclusion Mrs. Corner returned thanks to the committee for their attention; and the latter, without expressing an opinion on the matter, complimented the speakers on the ability and eloquence with which their views had been presented. It was also stated that a large number of petitions would be presented in support of the bill. The committee expressed themselves as unable, by reason of the lateness of the session and the pressure of other business, to promise an early report. The interview lasted about an hour, and was very cordial and pleasant on both sides.

September 25, 1868, the Universal Franchise Association held its first annual meeting* at Union League Hall, Mrs. Josephine S. Griffing presid-

* The officers elected were: *President*, United States Senator S. C. Pomeroy; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. Josephine S. Griffing, Mrs. Belva McNall Lockwood, Miss Stickney, Thaddeus Hyatt, Caroline B. Winslow, M. D., S. Yorke At Lee, Mrs. Josephine L. Slade, Prof. William J. Wilson, Mrs. Mary Olin, Judge A. B. Olin, Mrs. C. M. E. Y. Christian, Prof. George B. Vashon, J. H. Crossman, Mrs. Angeline

Digitized by Google

ing. A letter was read from Senator Pomeroy, stating that he was willing to act as president of the society. In closing he said:

I trust the friends will unite in one association. We have but one object in view, and should all labor together to accomplish this end, viz.: the enfranchisement of every citizen, with no partiality for race or sex. The American citizen is the only safe depository for the ballot, and the only safeguard for individual and national liberty. Let us labor to realize, even in our day and time, this true type of republican government. The rights and safety of individuals and of the nation demand it.

In 1869, the executive committee passed a resolution to expend the money that had been accumulated at the meetings of the association in a series of lectures for the purpose of enlightening the public mind upon the question of equal political rights for women. Among the speakers engaged were Anna Dickinson, Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony, D. R. Locke (Nasby), Theodore Tilton. From that time the women of the district were permitted to speak their minds freely.

In the House of Representatives, March 21, 1870, Mr. Arnell, on leave, introduced the following bill:

A bill to do justice to the female employees of the Government, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That hereafter all clerks and other employes in the civil service of the United States shall be paid, irrespective of sex, with reference to the character and amount of services performed by them.

SEC. 2. And be it further enacted, That, in the employment of labor, clerical or other, in any branch of the civil service of the United States, no discrimination shall be made in favor of either sex.

SEC. 3. And be it further enacted, That where examinations of candidates for positions in the civil service of the United States are prescribed by law, or by the heads of departments, bureaus, or offices, said examinations shall be of the same character for persons of both sexes.

SEC. 4. And be it further enacted, That the designations, chief clerk, chief or head of division, chief or head of section, clerk of the fourth class, clerk of the third class, clerk of the second class, clerk of the first class, copyist, messenger, laborer, and all other designations of employes, in existing acts of Congress, or in use in any branch of the civil service of the United States, shall be held, hereafter to apply to women as well as to men; and that women shall be regarded equally eligible with men to perform the duties of the afore-designated clerks and employes, and shall receive the compensation therefor prescribed by law.

SEC. 5. And be it further enacted, That this act shall not be so construed as to require the displacement of any person now employed, but shall apply to all vacancies hereafter occurring, for any cause.

SEC. 6. And be it further enacted, That all acts and parts of acts, in conflict with any of the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, expressly repealed.

Thousands of petitions for this bill were circulated. Mrs. Lockwood went to New York, and secured seven hundred signatures, visiting both of the suffrage conventions then in session in that city, the National and

---

S. Hall, Dr. C. B. Purvis, Mrs. Dr. Hathaway, Bishop Moore, Mrs. C. A. F. Stebbins, Giles B. Stebbins, Miss Emily Stanton, Dr. John Mayhew, John R. Elvana, J. C. O. Whaley, Charles Roeser, George T. Downing; *Recording Secretary*, George F. Needham; *Treasurer*, Daniel Breed; *Board of Managers*, Josephine S. Griffing, Hamilton Wilcox, Dr. Daniel Breed, Mrs. Corner, Geo. F. Needham, Mrs. Lydia S. Hall, J. H. Crane; *Corresponding Secretary*, Mrs. Mary T. Corner. Letters were reported from Frederick Douglass, George William Curtis, Mrs. E. Oakes Smith. Addresses were delivered by J. H. Crossman, G. F. Needham, Mrs. Lockwood, R. J. Hinton, and Mr. Tibbits of Virginia. Dr. Breed recited an original poem, entitled, "Woman's Pledge to Freedom."

Digitized by Google

the American. The bill was shortly afterward passed in a modified form, and has ever since been in force in all of the government departments.

In February, 1871, congress passed the organic act for the district, making of it a territory and granting suffrage to the male members of the commonwealth. There was also granted under this bill a right to a delegate in congress. In the meetings which followed for the nomination of delegates a number of women took part. Mrs. Lockwood often broke the monotony with a short speech, and on one occasion only lacked one vote of an election to the general convention for the nomination of a delegate to congress.

The women of the district were not permitted to vote under the organic act, but soon after the organization of its legislature, bills to provide for this were introduced into both Houses. Mrs. Lockwood prepared an exhaustive address upon these pending bills, and was granted a hearing before both Houses of the legislature, but they were finally lost. In 1875 congress withdrew the legislative power from the people of the District of Columbia.

It was also in 1871 that the National University Law School, then principally under the control of Prof. Wm. B. Wedgewood, organized a law class for women, in which fifteen matriculated. Mrs. Lockwood had been denied admission the previous year to the law class of Columbia College for the reason, as given by the trustees, "that it would distract the attention of the young men." About this time a young colored woman, Charlotte Ray of New York, was graduated from the law class of Howard University and admitted to the bar with the class. Of the fifteen women who entered the National University only two completed the course, viz., Lydia S. Hall, and Belva A. Lockwood. The former never received her diploma. The latter, after an appeal to President Grant, received her diploma, and was admitted to the district bar, September 23, 1873. Since that period Emma M. Gillett, Marilla M. Ricker, and Laura DeForce Gordon have been admitted to the district bar, and there seems to be no longer any hindrance to such admissions. The above-named have all appeared in court, and a number of other ladies have been graduated in the district. Women have also been appointed notaries public, and examiners in chancery.

In the profession of medicine there has been more liberality. Dr. Susan A. Edson and Dr. Caroline B. Winslow have been in full practice here since the close of the war. Dr. Mary Parsons and Dr. Cora M. Bland and others, are practicing with marked success. Last year there were fourteen women duly registered with the health department, and they all seem to be in good standing. Howard University has admitted women to its medical classes for some years, and both white and colored women have availed themselves of the privilege. Last year Columbia College opened its doors in the medical department, with a suggestion that the classes in law and theology may soon be opened also.

Many women in the district within the last few years have entered into business for themselves, as they are now permitted to do under the law of 1869, and are milliners, merchants, market-women, hucksters. In the art of nursing, which has been reduced to a science, they have free course.

In 1871, a large number of ladies tried to register in the city of Washington. They marched in solid phalanx some seventy* strong to the registrar's office, but were repulsed. They tried afterwards to vote, but were refused, whereupon Mrs. Spencer sued the inspectors, and Mrs. Webster sued the registrars, so testing their rights in two suits in the Supreme Court of the District.†

In 1866 Jane G. Swisshelm commenced the publication of a liberal sheet in the District of Columbia, known as *The Wasp*. This was the continuation of a paper formerly published by her in Pittsburg, Pa., and in St. Cloud, Minn., called *The Visitor*. Many other papers by women have been since published in the District. Perhaps the most voluminous author in this country is Mrs. E. D. E. N. Southworth, who has written a volume for each year of her life, and is now sixty-five years of age. Her authorship has been confined to romances, which have been very popular. A large proportion of the teachers of the public schools in the District are women, some of them of very marked culture. Many of the most noted and successful private schools, some with collegiate courses, are conducted by women. Among these, Mrs. Margaret Harover who taught in the District during the war, is worthy of mention, also Mrs. Ellen M. O'Connor, president of the Miner school. Mrs. Sarah J. Spencer, as associate principal of the Spencerian business college whence large classes of young women have been graduated for many years past, is deservedly popular. She was at one time prominent in the woman suffrage movement, acting as corresponding secretary of the National Association. She is now engaged in one of the large charity organizations of the city. Many colored women who have been graduated from Howard University, have become quite successful as teachers, and some have studied medicine. All of the copyists in the office of registrar of deeds are women. A goodly number are short-hand reporters for the courts, among whom Miss Camp, daughter of the assistant clerk, is notably skillful.

The number of women who hold property in the District is large and rapidly increasing. A woman may now enter into almost any honorable profession that she chooses, and maintain her respectability. All of the professions are open to her, and the sphere of trades is rapidly widening. The progress made in this regard in the last quarter of a century amounts almost to a revolution. The first women ever admitted to the reporter's

* The names of the women who attempted to register and vote were: Jane A. Archibald, Clara M. Archibald, Mary Anderson, S. W. Aiken, Sallie S. Barrett, Mary B. Baumgras, Florence Riddle Bartlett, Ann M. Boyle, M. W. Browne, Deborah B. Clarke (Grace Greenwood's mother, eighty years of age), C. W. Campbell, Elizabeth T. Cowperthwaite, Mary T. Corner, Mary M. Courtenay, Mary A. Donaldson, Mary A. Dennison, Ruth Carr Dennison, L. S. Doolittle, Dr. Susan A. Edson, Sarah P. Edson, B. F. Evans, E. W. Foster, Olive Freeman, Maggie Finney, Julia H. Grey, Josephine S. Griffing, A. A. Henning, Susie J. Hickey, Calista Hickey, E. M. Hickey, Mary Hooper, Ruth G. D. Havens, E. E. Hill, Lydia S. Hall, Julia Archibald Holmes, N. M. Johnson, Jennie V. Jewell, Carrie Ketchum, Joanna Kelly, Sara J. Lippincott (Grace Greenwood), Belva A. Lockwood, Susie S. McClure, A. Jennie Miles, Augusta E. Morris, M. T. Middleton, Savangie E. Mark, A. E. Newton, M. C. Page, Eliza Ann Peck, Mary A. Riddle, A. R. Riddle, Caroline Risley, Sarah Andrews Spencer, E. D E. N. Southworth, Caroline A. Sherman, Mary S. Scribner, Belle Smith, Maria T. Stoddard, Ada E. Spurgeon, Rubina Taylor, Harriet P. Trickham, Eliza M. Tibbetts, Dr. Caroline B. Winslow, Sarah E. Webster (mother of Dr. Susan A. Edson), Julia A. Wilbur, Mrs. Westfall, Mary Willard, Amanda Wall, Lucy A. Wheeler.

† For full account see Vol. II., page 587.

Digitized by Google

gallery of the Senate and House were Abigail Dodge (Gail Hamilton), and Helen M. Barnard, both political writers of great power; the former as a reporter for the New York *Times*, and the latter for the New York *Herald*. Mrs. Barnard, during Grant's administration, was sent as commissioner of immigration to Liverpool, visiting England, Ireland and Scotland. Returning in the steerage of an ocean steamer, she gave one of the finest reports ever made upon this question. This resulted in the passage by the legislature of New York of a bill for the better protection of emigrants on shipboard, and the appointment by the United States government of an inspector of immigration for every out-going steamer.

Women were first appointed as clerks in the government departments in 1861 by Secretary Chase, at the earnest solicitation of Treasurer Spinner. They were employed at temporary work at $50 a month—one-half the lowest price paid to any male clerk—until they were recognized by an act of congress in which their salary was fixed at $900 a year, in the general appropriation bill of July 23, 1866. The men doing the same work were of four classes, receiving, respectively, $1,000, $1,400, $1,600, $1,800. Treasurer Spinner, in his report of October, 1866, said:

> The experiment of employing females as clerks has been, so far as this office is concerned, a success. For many kinds of office-work, like the manipulation and counting of fractional currency, they excel, and in my opinion are to be preferred to males. There is, however, quite as much difference in point of ability between female clerks as there is between the several classes of male clerks, whose equals some of them are. Some are able to accomplish twice as much as others, and with greater accuracy. So, too, some of them incur great risks, being responsible for making mistakes in count, and for counterfeits overlooked. Such should, by every consideration of justice and fair dealing, be paid according to their merits, and the risks and liabilities they incur.

And in 1868, Mr. Spinner urged the committee of which Mr. Fessenden of Maine was the chairman, to so amend the bill providing for the reorganization of the treasury department as to increase the salary of the female clerks who have the handling of money, stating that cases had occurred in which women had lost more than half their monthly pay by reason of being short in count, or of allowing counterfeit notes to pass their hands.

Secretary M'Cullough asserted that women performed their clerical duties as creditably as men, and stated that he had three ladies who performed as much labor, and did it as well as any three male clerks receiving $1,800 a year. It is now a quarter of a century that women have served the government in these responsible positions, and still, with but few exceptions, they receive only the allotted $900. Mrs. Fitzgerald, the expert in the redemption bureau of the treasury, who has for fifteen years deciphered defaced currency, in which no man has ever yet proved her equal, receives $1,400. In 1886 she subjected herself to an examination for an increase to $1,600, but, failing to answer some questions foreign to her art, she was compelled to content herself with the former salary.

II.—Maryland.

The Revolution of February 26, 1868, shows an effort in the direction of progress on this question in Maryland. A correspondent says:

Notwithstanding the present ascendancy of conservatism in Maryland, the progressive element is not wholly annihilated; in proof of which, we send information of the working of this leaven, as developed in an association lately organized in the city of Baltimore, under the name of the "Maryland Equal Rights Society." For nearly a year past it has been in contemplation to form a society based upon the principle of equal chance to all human kind, irrespective of sex or color, through the mediumship of the elective franchise. The first public meeting of the friends of the movement was held on the afternoon of November 12, 1867, at the Douglass Institute, at which twelve persons, white and colored, were present. Some steps were taken towards organization in the framing and adopting of a constitution based upon the principle afore-mentioned; but further business was deferred in hope of securing a larger attendance at a subsequent meeting. Two weeks later a second meeting was called, when the constitution was signed by fourteen persons, ten of whom were white and four colored. Officers were chosen, consisting of a president, a vice-president, a secretary and a treasurer, together with eight other members to act as an executive committee. The last meeting, held January 29, was attended by Alfred H. Love and Rachel Love of Philadelphia. To Mr. Love the society is indebted for many valuable suggestions as to the best means of becoming an effective co-worker in the cause of human progress.

Our colored friends, who have control of the Douglass Institute, have testified their good will toward the movement in giving the society the use of an apartment in the building, free of charge. This is the one instance in which we have met with encouragement in our own community. We have sought it in high places, among those we supposed to be friends, and found it not. It appears to be the nature of fine linen to dread the mud splashes of the pioneer's spade and pick-ax, and for silk and broadcloth to shrink from contact with the briers of an uncleared thicket; hence our sole recourse is to appeal to those only who are dressed for the service. We are conscious that we have entered upon no easy task; but, ashamed of having so long left our Northern sisters to toil and endure alone in a cause which is not one of section but of humanity, we come forward at last to assume our share of the hardship, trusting that what we have lost in our tardiness may be made up in earnestness and activity.

From various papers we clip the following items:

At the election in Baltimore, January 20, 1870, there were three women who applied to be registered as voters at the third-ward registry office. Their names were Mrs. L. C. Dundore, Mrs. A. M. Gardner and Miss E. M. Harris. Their cases were held under advisement by the register.——In 1871, a Maryland young lady, Miss Middlebrook, raised over 5,000 heads of cabbage. On Christmas, she sold in the Baltimore market 500 pounds of turkey at 20 cents per pound.——Mrs. H. B. Conway of Frederick county, has established a reputation as a contractor for "fills" and "cuts." She has filled several contracts in Pennsylvania, been awarded a $100,000 job on the Western Maryland railroad, and now, 1885, is engaged in the work of excavating a tract in Baltimore for building-sites.

Miss R. Muller has for several years been engaged as subscription and general correspondence clerk for the Baltimore *Daily American*. She was the first woman to be employed in that city on newspaper work during the present century. In the chapter on newspapers it will be seen that Anna R. Green established the first newspaper in the Maryland colony one hundred and nineteen years ago, doing the colony printing; and that Mary R. Goddard not only published a paper, writing able editorials, but was also the first postmaster after the revolution. And from the following item it would seem that the first woman to claim her right to vote must be credited to Maryland:

At the regular meeting of the Maryland Historical Society in Baltimore, December, 1885, Hon. J. L. Thomas read a paper on "Margaret Brent, the first woman in

Digitized by Google

America to claim the right to vote." She lived at St. Mary's city on the river of the same name two hundred and forty years ago, and was related to Lord Baltimore. She was the heir of Leonard Calvert, Lord Baltimore's brother and agent, and as such she claimed not only control of all rents, etc., of Lord Baltimore, but also the right to two votes in the assembly as the representative of both Calvert and Baltimore. The first claim the courts upheld, but the second was rejected.

On March 20, 1872, Hon. Stevenson Archer made an exhaustive speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, entitled, "Woman Suffrage not to be tolerated, although advocated by the Republican candidate for vice-presidency." The speech was against Senator Wilson's bill to enfranchise the women of the territories. The honorable representative from Maryland may have been moved to enter his protest against woman's enfranchisement by the fact that the women of his State had in convention assembled early in the same month made a public demand for their political rights:

The Havre de Grace *Republican* says that the convention of the Maryland Equal Rights Association, held in Raine's Hall, Baltimore, last week, was a grand success. Mrs. Lavina C. Dundore, president of the association, presided over the convention with dignity and grace. Many prominent and able champions of the cause were present and delivered eloquent and telling addresses in favor of woman's enfranchisement, which were listened to with marked attention by the large audiences in attendance. The friends of the cause in Maryland feel much gratified at this exhibition of the rapidly increasing interest in the movement.

Meetings had been held in Baltimore during the years of 1870–71, and lectures given by Lucy Stone, Julia Ward Howe, Susan B. Anthony, and others.

Charlotte Richmond of Baltimore writes the *Woman's Journal*, April 22, 1873:

The American *Journal of Dental Science* makes the following statement: "The Baltimore College of Dental Surgery, having had the honor of conferring the first degree of Doctor of Dental Surgery in the world, has also graduated the first woman who ever received a diploma in medicine or dentistry in Baltimore, in the person of Miss Emilie Foeking of Prussia, who, after attending two full courses of lectures and demonstrations, passed a very creditable final examination. Miss Foeking conformed to all the rules and regulations of the college during the two sessions that she was a student; no favor whatever as to requirement being asked for on her part, or extended to her by the faculty, on account of sex. She has fairly earned her degree by proficiency and earnest application. After a short time Miss Foeking will return to Berlin, where she intends to locate. That she will succeed in establishing a large and lucrative practice, there is no doubt, as she is well qualified professionally, and is in manner so perfect a lady as to command the respect of all who know her."

You will see by this extract from one of our medical journals, that a lady has been graduated from our dental college. I hope she has left the doors open, so that some of our own countrywomen may enter and acquit themselves as honorably, but without the difficulties which she has been compelled to encounter. You are aware of the proceedings of the Philadelphia college in regard to female students. Our Baltimore dentist, for we feel proud to claim her as ours, although admitted in the college, still had all the prejudices to meet in the minds of the people, but they were too courteous and hospitable to act upon those feelings so far as to turn her from their doors. She was brave and did not surrender; not even when her sensitive woman's heart was wounded and humiliated by the little acts done heedlessly under the impression that a woman had stepped out of her sphere and was taking upon herself a vocation belonging exclusively to men. She is naturally sincere, modest and dignified. With these

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1924 L

Mary B. Clay.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

lady-like qualifications, together with ability and perseverance, she has won the honor and esteem of the faculty and the students.

I wish that Prussia could have witnessed the success of her daughter on the night of commencement—the wreaths of laurel, and the incessant applause while she was on the stage. I, for one, felt quite proud to see my city acknowledge the foreign lady-student so gracefully. She is already practicing to some extent, and in every case gives the most entire satisfaction. I trust there will be no more college doors closed against our sex, for the reason that the male students do not want us. Let the professors and trustees be just. We have proved that a true lady is no disadvantage in a college with male students. I think the way is now clear for women to enter upon the dental profession. Miss Foeking has proved that a woman can be successful when she undertakes an honorable profession.

For the facts in regard to the Baltimore Dental College we are indebted to the dean of the faculty:

BALTIMORE COLLEGE OF DENTAL SURGERY, Jan. 2, 1886.

MISS SUSAN B. ANTHONY—*Dear Miss:* Your letter of 27th of last month came safely to hand. In reply I will say that only two members of the fair sex have been graduated with us. Miss Emilie Foeking of Prussia, whose present address I do not know, and Miss Pauline Boeck of Germany, who has since died. Miss Foeking was graduated in 1873, and Miss Boeck in 1877. I have learned that both of these young ladies were attentive and energetic in the pursuit of their studies, and were graduated with credit to themselves. We have the "Woman's Medical College," from which quite a number of young women have been graduated. For information in regard to this institution I would refer you to its dean, Prof. Wm. D. Booker, 157 Park avenue.

Very truly yours, R. B. WINDER.

III.—DELAWARE.

Mary A. Stuart is the active representative of the movement for woman suffrage in Delaware. From year to year she has written and contributed to our National conventions in Washington, and has been among the delegates on several occasions to address congressional committees. In her report she says:

My father was the first man in the State Senate to propose the repeal of some of our oppressive laws, and succeeded in having the law giving all real estate to the eldest male heir repealed. The law of 1871 gave a married woman the right to make a will, provided her husband gave his written consent, with the names of two respectable witnesses thereunto attached. In 1873 the law was repealed, and another act passed giving married women the right to make a will, buy property and hold it exempt from the husband's debts, but this law does not affect his tenancy by courtesy.

Prior to 1868, bonds, mortgages, stocks, etc., were counted personal property, all of which went into the possession of the husband the moment the woman answered "I will," in the marriage ceremony. I worked hard to get the law passed giving the wife the right to her own separate earnings, and at last was greatly helped by the fact that a woman petitioned for a divorce, stating in her application that she was driven from her home, that she and her two children had worked hard and saved $100 for a rainy day, and now her husband claimed the money. It was a case in point, and helped the members of our legislature to pass the wages bill.

Delaware College, the only institution of the kind in the State, was open to girls for thirteen years, but owing to a tragedy committed by the boys in hazing one another, resulting in death, the doors were thereafter closed to girls, although they were in no way directly or indirectly implicated in the outrages. When Governor Stockley was appealed to, he simply gave some of the old arguments against coëducation, and did

not recommend, as he should have done, an appropriation at once by the State to build a similar college, with all the necessary appointments for the education of girls. We have women who are practicing physicians, and are also in the State Medical Boards. We have none who practice law or preach in our pulpits, and all the political offices of the State are closed to women. No notaries, bank cashiers, telegraph operators. Women are still in the belief that work outside the home is a disgrace to the men of their families.

In February, 1881, Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony, Miss Couzins and Mrs. Lockwood, held various hearings before the legislature. Mrs. Lockwood read to the gentlemen article 4 of the constitution as amended in 1834: "Any white male citizen over 22 years of age who shall be a tax-payer, shall be eligible to vote for electors." She then showed them how readily, without any marked revolution, the word "white" had been stricken out, while the word tax-payer had virtually become a dead letter. Then turning to the first paragraph of the United States revised code she cited the passage which states that in determining the meaning of statutes after February 25, 1877, "words importing the masculine gender may be applied to females." * * * * At this point the chairman of the committee placed before Mrs. Lockwood the Delaware code from which she read a similar application of the law made many years before. Having laid this foundation she asserted that the women of Delaware were legally entitled to vote under the laws as they are, but that to prevent all question on the subject, she would recommend a special enactment like that prepared in the bill before them. An amendment to the State constitution giving suffrage to women was presented in the House of Representatives in February, 1881, and referred to the committee on privileges and elections. It was reported adversely. The vote showed that all the members, with two * exceptions, were opposed to the measure.

Among the friends in Delaware were several liberal families, active in all the progressive movements of the day. Preëminent among these was that of the noble Thomas Garrett, whose good words of encouragement for woman's enfranchisement may be found in the bound copies of *The Revolution* as far back as 1868. His private letters to those of us interested in his labors of love are among our most cherished mementoes. He was a man of good judgment, broad sympathies, and unswerving integrity.

IV.—Kentucky.

Mary B. Clay, daughter of Cassius M. Clay, sends us the following report of what has been done to change the status of women in Kentucky:

The earliest agitation of the suffrage question in our State arose from the advent of Miss Lucy Stone in Louisville, in 1853, at which time she delivered three lectures in Masonic Hall to crowded audiences. George D. Prentice gave full and friendly reports in the *Courier-Journal.* In later years, Anna Dickinson and others have lectured in our chief cities. But the first note of associated effort is that given in *The Revolution* from Glendale, which says:

We organized here an association with twenty members the first of October, 1867, and now have fifty. We hope soon to have the whole of Hardin county, and by the close of another year the whole of the State of Kentucky, enlisted on the side of woman's rights.

* David Eastburn and Henry Swaine of New Castle county.

Digitized by Google

In the winter of 1872 Hannah Tracy Cutler and Margaret V. Longley were granted a respectful hearing before our legislature at Frankfort. In May, 1879, self-appointed, I represented Kentucky at the May anniversary of the National Association at St. Louis. In the autumn following, Miss Anthony, during an extended lecture tour through the State, stopped in Richmond several days, and aided us in organizing a local suffrage society.* Letters were at once written to the leading editors asking them to publish articles on the subject. Many favorable answers were received, and we have largely availed ourselves of the columns of the papers to keep up the agitation. My sister, Sally Clay Bennett, edits a column in the Richmond *Register*, sister Anne a column in the Lexington *Gazette*, and Kate Dunning Clarke, a column in the *Turf, Field and Farm*. Mrs. Clarke is also associate editor of the Kentucky *State Jonrnal*. The Misses Moore are making a success of a daily paper at Milledgeville.

In May, 1880, Mrs. Bennett and myself were delegates at the great National Mass Convention in Farwell Hall, Chicago. In October, 1881, the American Association held its annual meeting in Louisville. It was largely attended and fully and fairly reported by the press of the city. At its close, a Kentucky State association was organized, with Laura Clay as president.

In January, 1882, the Richmond and Louisville clubs secured a hearing before the judiciary committee of the Senate, Mrs. Bennett and myself representing the former, and John A. Ward the latter. With the valuable aid of Mrs. Mary Haggart of Indianapolis we made a most favorable impression upon our legislators. The points in which our laws are defective and upon which our appeals and arguments were based are well indicated by the pleas of our several petitions:

That women might have municipal and presidential suffrage by statute; that in marriage women might own their property as men own theirs; that women who were married might be the legal guardians of their children's property and persons as well as the father; that women should be appointed with equal responsibility and authority as assistant physicians in insane asylums, and that the appointment of all the officers in such asylums should be made by the legislature, and not by the governor, as now; that women be appointed on boards of visitors and commissioners to all asylums where women are inmates or prisoners.

In 1884, all of the Clay sisters—Mrs. Bennet, Mary, Laura and Anne—with Mrs. Haggart, again went to Frankfort, and held meetings in the legislative hall, which were largely attended by the best classes of the citizens of that city, as well as by members of the legislature.

For several years we have had a woman for State Librarian. In Fayette, one of our most aristocratic counties, Lexington being its county seat, a woman was elected to the office of county clerk by a majority of 200 over her male competitor. In two other connties women are also county clerks. Each of them had served so efficiently in her husband's office, that at his death she had been elected in his place.

That woman has to fight every step of her way to the recognition of her rights as a citizen equal before the law, is shown by the following despatch from Frankfort, dated December 18, 1885:

* The officers were: Sally Clay Bennett, Maggie S. Burnham, Mrs. Somers, Mary B. Clay.

Digitized by Google

Mrs. M. C. Lucas was elected by the vote of Daviess county to the office of jailer, to succeed her husband, who was killed by a mob while in discharge of his duty. When she appeared before the county court to give bond for the office, the Judge refused to allow her to qualify. A writ of mandamus from the Circuit Court was applied for to compel the court to allow her to qualify, but the motion was denied. An appeal was then taken to the Court of Appeals. Yesterday that court affirmed the decision of the Circuit Court, that a woman cannot legally hold the office of county jailer.

A woman in Madison county acted as census-taker, and performed her duty well. She was the niece of Mr. Justice Miller of the Supreme Court of the United States. Gen. W. J. Sanderson, internal revenue collector for the eighth district, employed two young ladies as clerks, Miss Brown and Miss Price, the former of whom is said to be his best clerk. She is the sister of Mrs. Smith, the circuit clerk of Laurel county. The successor of General Sanderson, employs his two daughters as clerks, and they receive the same pay as men who do the same work.

Many women in our State manage their own farms. My mother, during my father's absence as minister to Russia, took his farm of 2,500 acres (he making her his attorney), paid off a large debt on the property, built an elegant house costing $30,000, stocked the farm, and largely supported the family of six children, with money which she made during the war. She fed government mules, and did it so well that she would return them to camp before the time expired, in better condition than most feeders got theirs. She is now, 1885, conducting her own farm of 350 acres, selling several thousand dollars' worth of wheat, cattle, and sheep annually, giving her personal attention to everything, at the age of seventy. During the adventurous and perilous period of my father's life she shared his dangers, and was ever his mainstay in upholding his hands against slavery; and in that crowning point of his life, when he was mobbed in Lexington, my mother sat at his bed-side, and wrote at his dictation, "Go tell your secret conclave of dastardly assassins, Cassius M. Clay knows his rights and how to defend them."

Two of my sisters, Laura and Anne, and myself are practical farmers, each having under her immediate superintendence the workmen, both white and black, on 300 acres. We raise corn, wheat, oats, cattle and sheep, buying and selling our own stock and produce. We took possession of the land without stock or utensils, and by our observation and experience, prudence and industry, have greatly improved the lands and stock, and annually realize a handsome income therefrom.

Miss Laura R. White of Manchester, sister of Hon. John D. White, who ably advocated our cause in congress as well as in his own State, was graduated with marked honor from the Michigan State University in 1874. Since that time she has studied architecture in the Boston Institute of Technology one year, worked as draughtsman in the office of the supervisory architect of the treasury department at Washington, two years, studied in the special school of architecture in Paris one year, and is now, 1886, prosecuting her studies with a liberal selection of French and English architectural works at her mountain home in Kentucky. Mrs. Bessie White Heagen, the youngest daughter of Mrs. Sarah A. White, was graduated with honor from the Roxbury High School of Boston, and from the

Digitized by Google

school of Pharmacy of Michigan University. Being denied examination and the privileges of college graduates of the college of pharmacy at Louisville, where she was employed by a prominent pharmacist, she brought suit and obtained a verdict in her favor.

Early in 1882, Dr. J. P. Barnum employed young women in his store with the expectation of being able to educate them in the college of pharmacy. But the hostility of the students to the proposed innovation, and the lack of a systematic laboratory course, caused the relinquishment of that plan and the formation of the new school. Prominent gentlemen in the community assisted Dr. Barnum, and the Louisville School of Pharmacy was duly incorporated under the general laws of Kentucky.* Though sustained by men of wealth and influence, the school met with great opposition, the State Board of Pharmacy refusing to register the women who were graduated from it until compelled to do so by a mandamus from the Law and Equity Court, Judge Simral presiding. March 7, 1884, the legislature incorporated the Louisville School of Pharmacy for Women, and by special enactment empowered its graduates to practice their profession without registration or interference from the State board.

The school confers two degrees; its full course taking three years and requiring more work than is done in other schools. So far its graduates have been representative women, and all have found responsible situations awaiting them. Its faculty remains, with a few exceptions, as in the first session. Dr. J. P. Barnum, to whose indefatigable efforts the foundation of the school is due, is dean and professor of pharmacy and analytical chemistry; Dr. T. Hunt Stuckey, a graduate of Heidelberg University, who joined his efforts with Dr. Barnum at an early day, is professor of *materia medica*, toxicology and microscopy. Mrs. D. N. Marble, professor of general and pharmaceutical chemistry, and Mrs. Fountaine Miller, professor of botany, were graduates of the first class.

Mrs. Kate Trimble de Roode, in a recent letter says:

Kentucky has had school suffrage for thirty years, but as the right is not generally known or understood, few women have ever availed themselves of the privilege. The State librarian has for many years been a woman, and there are several post-mistresses also in this State. The State University has recently admitted women on equal terms to all its departments. As a general thing the young women of Kentucky are better educated than the men, the latter being early put to business, while most parents desire above all things to secure to their daughters a liberal education. We have a number of women practicing medicine in the larger cities, one architect, but as yet no lawyers, although several women have taken a full course of study for that profession. The question of woman suffrage has been but little agitated in this State, although the

* The incorporators who formed the Board of Regents were, the Right Rev. Thomas U. Dudley, D. D., Bishop of Kentucky; Rev. James P. Boyce, D. D., President of the Baptist Theological Seminary; Rev. E. F. Perkins, Rector of St. Paul's Church; Hon. I. H. Edwards, Chancellor of Louisville Chancery Court; Theodore Harris, President Louisville Banking and Insurance Co.; W. N. Haldeman, President *Courier Journal* Co.; Nicholas Finzer, President of Finzer tobacco works; Samuel L. Avery, President B. F. Avery Co.; G. H. Cochran, President Louisville School Board; Robert Cochran, Commissioner of Chancery Court; Hon. Charles Godshaw, Trustee of Jury Fund; Dr. E. A. Grant and Mr. James K. Lemon. The board was organized by the election of Mr. Theodore Harris, *President*, Dr. E. A. Grant, *Secretary*, and James K. Lemon, *Treasurer*. The school opened with fifteen students, and continued until June, 1883. A lecture and practical course combined, occupy ten months of the year—lectures being given five afternoons of each week during the term.

Digitized by Google

last legislature gave a respectful hearing to several ladies on the question. The property rights of married women are in a crude state; the wife's personal property vests in the husband; the profits and rents that accrue from her real estate belong to him also. She can make no will without the assent of her husband, and if given, he can revoke it at any time before the will is probated. The wife's wages belong to her husband. She cannot sue or be sued without he joins her in the suit. The wife's dower is a life interest in a third of the husband's real estate, whereas the husband's curtesy, where there is issue of the marriage, born alive, is a life interest in all the real estate belonging to the wife at the time of her death. This is the statutory law, but the wife by obtaining a decree in chancery may possess all the rights of a *femme sole*. A bill securing more equal rights to women passed the House of the last legislature, but failed in the Senate. The courtesy of Kentucky men to women in general, has kept them from realizing their civil and political degradation, until, by some sudden turn in the wheel of fortune, the individual woman has felt the iron teeth of the law in her own flesh, and warned her slumbering sisterhood. We are now awaking to the fact that an aristocracy of sex in a republic is as inconsistent and odious as an aristocracy of color, and indeed far more so.

V.—Tennessee.

We are indebted to Mrs. Elizabeth Lisle Saxon for the following:

Elizabeth Avery Meriwether is the chief representative of liberal thought in Tennessee. Her pen is ever ready to champion the wronged. I first came to know her when engaged in a newspaper discussion to reestablish in the public schools of Memphis three young women who had been dismissed because of "holding too many of Mrs. Meriwether's views"—the reason actually given by the superintendent and endorsed by the board of directors. A seven month's war was carried on, ending in a triumphant reinstallment of the teachers, a new superintendent, and a new board of directors. Public opinion was educated into more liberal ideas, and the *Memphis Appeal*, through its chivalrous editor, Mr. Keating, declared squarely for woman suffrage.

When Col. Kerr introduced into the Tennessee legislature a bill making divorce impossible for any cause save adultery, Mrs. Meriwether wrote the ablest article I ever read, in opposition, which Mr. Keating published in his paper, and distributed among the members of the legislature. The result was a clear vote against the bill.

With Mrs. Lide Meriwether and Mrs. M. J. Holmes, she publicly assailed the cross examination of women in criminal trials, either as culprits or witnesses, until the practice was broken up, and private hearings accorded. In 1876 she sent a memorial to the National Democratic convention at St. Louis, asking that party to declare for woman suffrage in its platform. Though her appeal was not read, hundreds of copies were circulated among the members in the hope of stirring thought on the subject in the South. It provoked much sarcasm because it was signed only by Mrs. Meriwether and Mrs. Saxon. In 1880-81 Mrs. Meriwether was one of the speakers in the series of conventions held by the National association in the Western and New England States.

Digitized by Google

VI.—VIRGINIA.

In the winter of 1870, immediately after the National Washington convention, Mrs. Paulina Wright Davis, while spending a few days in Richmond, formed the acquaintance of Mrs. Anna Whitehead Bodeker, a most earnest advocate of the ballot for women. Mrs. Davis held a parlor meeting in the home of Mrs. Bodeker, enlisting the interest of several prominent citizens of Richmond, who very soon invited Mrs. Joslyn Gage to their city to give a series of lectures. Of the result of this visit we give Mrs. Bodeker's report as published in *The Revolution* of May, 1870:

DEAR REVOLUTION:—I glory in announcing a grand achievement in the great reform of the day in Virginia. Our energetic and heroic leader, Mrs. M. Joslyn Gage, after giant efforts on her part, and with the aid of some strong advocates of the reform, on Friday evening, May 6, 1870, organized in the city of Richmond a Virginia State Woman Suffrage Association. The whole proceedings I here append, for immediate publication in your columns.

Mrs. Gage, advisory counsel for New York, in the National Woman Suffrage Association of America, delivered a lecture upon "Opportunity for Woman," at Bosher's Hall, corner of Ninth and Main streets, on Thursday evening. The lecture was able, earnest and eloquent, and was listened to with rapt attention by the friends of the cause present. At its conclusion, Judge John C. Underwood gave notice that on the following evening a meeting would be held at the United States Court room (which he freely proffered for the purpose) to organize a State Association, adopt a constitution, elect officers, and appoint delegates to the anniversary of the National Association soon to be held in New York city. The judge remarked that, upon conversing with Governor Wise upon the subject, he expressed his warm sympathy with the objects of the movement save upon the question of giving women the ballot. With all the other rights claimed, he was heartily in accord; especially, he thought, should the professions be opened to women, more particularly the medical, they being the natural physicians of their sex and of children.

Pursuant to the above notice, a meeting was held in the United States court-room. Judge John C. Underwood was called to preside. Previous to action on the regular business of the meeting, several articles favorable to the movement were read. Miss Sue L. F. Smith, daughter of the late Rev. Dr. Wm. A. Smith, read very charmingly a well-written essay prepared by herself in advocacy of granting to women the full meed of powers and responsibilities now enjoyed by men. Mr. William E. Colman read an article entitled "Clerical Denunciation of Woman Suffrage—A Defense," being a reply to a violent attack made by the Rev. Dr. Edwards of this city, upon the adherents of the movement, in a sermon delivered by him recently. A proposed constitution for the government of the Virginia State Woman Suffrage Association was adopted; after which came the election of officers* of the society. On motion of Judge Underwood, Miss Sue L. F. Smith was appointed delegate to represent Virginia in the National Association to be held in New York city May 12, 13, the society having by resolution connected itself as an auxiliary to said National Association. Mrs. Gage offered resolutions, which were unanimously adopted, after which she delivered a forcible address, enumerating many of the wrongs to which women are subjected in this State, dwelling particularly upon the laws depriving mothers of the right to their own children, placing the property of married women at the mercy of their husbands, and

* *President*, Mrs. Anne W. Bodeker, Richmond; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. Maria G. and Judge John C. Underwood, Mr. and Mrs. Judge Westal Willoughby, Mr. and Mrs. Judge Lysander Hill, all of Alexandria; Mr. R. M. Manly, Richmond; Mrs. Martha Haines Bennett, Norfolk; Mr. Andrew Washburne and Mr. William E. Coleman, Richmond; *Secretary*, Miss Sue L. F. Smith, Richmond; *Executive Committee*, Rev. W. F. Hemenway, Mrs. Andrew Washburne, Mrs. Dr. E. H. Smith, Dr. and Mrs. Langstedt, Richmond, and Mrs. Allen (Florence Percy) of Manchester.

Digitized by Google

depriving the wives of all voice in the disposition of the property possessed by them before marriage.

In the winter of 1871, Miss Anthony was honored by an invitation from the society, and held several meetings in Judge Underwood's court-room. About this time appeared the following:

Judge Underwood, having stated in a letter that after mature consideration he had come to the conclusion that the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, together with the enforcement act of May 31, 1870, have secured the right to vote to female citizens as fully as it is now exercised and enjoyed by male citizens, a test case is to be made at once in the Virginia courts. As there are very few advocates of woman suffrage in Virginia, some of the leaders of the movement in Washington are about to move to Alexandria to perfect an organization and be ready with a case when Judge Underwood opens court there.

But Mrs. Bodeker, who also memorialized the general assembly, was first to make the attempt to vote. The Richmond *Dispatch* describes the occasion:

Yesterday morning the judges of the second precinct of Marshall ward, J. F. Shinberger, esq., presiding, were surprised at the appearance of a lady at the polls. She wished to deposit a ballot, but as the judges declined to allow this, in view of her not having registered, she then asked to be permitted to have a paper with the following inscription placed in the ballot-box: "By the Constitution of the United States, I, Anne Whitehead Bodeker, have a right to give my vote at this election, and in vindication of it drop this note in the ballot-box, November 7, 1871." This paper was taken by the judges, and will be deposited with the ballots in the archives of the Hustings court.

One remarkable incident in Gen. Grant's administration was Miss Elizabeth VanLew's appointment as postmaster at Richmond. She held the office eight years, notwithstanding the persistent opposition of politicians. The *Ballot-Box* said:

Miss VanLew was postmaster in Richmond under Grant, introducing many reforms in the office, but through the envy of men, who were voters, she, a non-voter, lost her office, as she had lost wealth and friends from her devotion to the Union during the war. Now, since its close, she finds not only her former slave men permitted to make laws for her, but also those whom she opposed when they were seeking their country's life. But women of all ranks, white and colored, are awaking to their need of the ballot for self-protection.

The Philadelphia *Press*, edited by J. W. Forney, said:

Some covert enemies of the president and the new civil-service reform have been spreading a report, through sensational specials, that the Richmond post-office is to be given to some prominent Virginian of local standing as soon as Miss VanLew's commission expires. If there is any post-office in the United States in which the whole nation at this time has a special interest, it is this one of Richmond which the present incumbent holds, as it were, by a national right, and certainly by popular acclaim. We have not time in a brief paragraph to tell the striking story of what Miss VanLew has done and what she has suffered for the country. Her story will pass into standard history, however, as sadly illustrative of our times. She herself is known and loved wherever the horrors of Libby and Belle Isle are mourned and denounced.

VII.—West Virginia.

Hon. Samuel Young, in a letter to *The Revolution*, dated Senate Chamber, Wheeling, West Virginia, February 22, 1869, writes:

Digitized by Google

In 1867, I introduced a bill in the State Senate, looking to the enfranchisement of all women in West Virginia, who can read the Declaration of Independence intelligently, and write a legible hand, and have actually paid tax the year previous to their proposing to vote. But even this guarded bill had no friends but myself. * * * I introduced a resolution during the present session of our legislature, asking congress to extend the right of suffrage to women. Eight out of the twenty-two members of the Senate voted for it. This is quite encouraging—advancing from one to eight in two years. At this rate of progress, we may succeed by next winter. I give the names of those who are in favor of and voted for female suffrage in the Senate: Drummond, Doolittle, Humphreys, Hoke, Wilson, Workman, Young, and Farnsworth, president. The same senators voted to invite Miss Anna E. Dickinson to lecture in the state-house during her late visit to Wheeling.

VIII.—North Carolina.

We are indebted to Mrs. Mary Bayard Clarke of New Berne for the following:

Since 1868, when the constitution was changed, a married woman has absolute control of all the real estate she possessed before marriage or acquired by gift or devise after it, except the power to sell without the consent of her husband, who in his turn is not at liberty to sell any real estate possessed by him before marriage, or acquired after it, without the consent of his wife. Should he sell any real estate without the wife's consent, in writing, she can, after his death, claim her dower of one-third in such real estate. If she owns a farm and her husband manages it, she can claim full settlements from him, he having no more rights than any other agent whom she may employ. So her property, real and personal, is her individual right, with the income therefrom. But she cannot contract a debt that is binding on her property without the consent of her husband. With his written consent, which must be registered in the office of the clerk of the county in which she resides, she may become a free-trader with all the rights of a man, her husband having no claim to her gains and not being responsible for any debt which she may contract. By giving this written consent her husband virtually places her in the position of an unmarried woman, as far as her property is concerned.

In 1881, finding that a widow had no right to appoint a guardian for her children by "letters testamentary," I, through my son, William E. Clarke, who was then senator for this county in our State legislature, succeeded in getting this law so changed that she now has the same rights as a man. In cases of divorce or separation while the children are under age, it is discretionary with the judge to give the children to either parent; but public sentiment always gives them to the mother while young.

As a rule the women of the South are better educated than the men, the boys being put to work while the girls are at school. The girls are not trained to work in any way, and very few, as yet, see the necessity of being regularly trained to do anything by which they may make a living except as teachers. Our public-school system requires a course through the normal school for all teachers. Mixed schools are not popular with us, but we have been forced into them by the public-graded-school tax, which has crushed out our private schools. I am now, and have been for the past two years, making an effort to have women on our school-boards, and a female as well as a male principal for every mixed public school, on the ground that mothers have as much right to a voice in the education of their daughters as fathers have in that of their sons. We have female teachers in our public schools but not as principals, and the pay of the women is, regardless of the quality of their work, always considerably less than that of men.

Our Supreme Court granted a license to Miss Tabitha A. Holton to practice law, and there is no legal impediment in the way of one doing so. The same is true of the medical profession. Dr. Susan Dimock was a North Carolinian by birth and on her

Digitized by Google

application for admission to the State Medical Society was unanimously elected a member of that body. The African Methodist-Episcopal Conference, Bishop Turner presiding, ordained Miss Sarah A. Hughes of Raleigh, a bright mulatto girl, as deacon in the church. Shortly after the close of the late war, my husband being then incapacitated for work by wounds received in the Mexican and the civil war, and my sons under age, I applied to Governor Jonathan Worth for the position of State librarian. Though cordially acknowledging my fitness, intellectually, for the office, and admitting that my sex did not legally disqualify me to hold it, he positively refused to appoint me or any other woman to any office in his gift. Public sentiment then sustained him, but it would not now do so; so many ladies of culture, refinement and social position have been, since the war, forced to work or starve, that it is now nothing remarkable to see them and their daughters doing work which twenty years ago they would have been ostracised for undertaking.

In a letter to the Boston *Index*, published August, 1885, the venerable Mrs. Elizabeth Oakes Smith, who is now a resident of this State, truthfully says .

The women of the North can have little conception of the hindrances which their sisters of the South encounter in their efforts to accept new and progressive ideas. The other sex, in a blind sort of way, hold fast to an absolute kind of chivalry akin to that of the renowned Don Quixote, by which they try to hold women in the background as a kind of porcelain liable to crack and breakage unless daintily handled. Women here see the spirit of the age and the need of change far more clearly than the men, and act up to this light, but with a flexible grace that disarms opposition. They see the necessity of work and are turning their attention to methods for remunerative labor, far more difficult to obtain at the South than at the North.

I cordially endorse this extract. The Southern man does not wish his "women folks" to be self-supporting, not because he is jealous of their rivaling him, but because he feels it is his duty to be the bread-winner. But the much sneered at "chivalry" of the South, while rendering it harder for a woman to break through old customs, most cordially and heartily sustains her when she has successfully done so. There are fewer large centers in the South than in the North, and much less attrition of mind against mind; the people are homogeneous and slower to change, and public opinion is much less fluctuating. But once let the tide of woman suffrage fairly turn, and I believe it will be irresistable and advance far more steadily and rapidly in the South than it has done in the North. Let the Southern women be won over and the cause will have nothing to fear from the opposition of the men. But, after twenty years' experience as a journalist, my honest opinion is that until the Southern women can be made to feel the pecuniary advantages to them of suffrage, they will not lift a finger or speak a word to obtain it.

In 1881, at the March meeting of the Raleigh Typographical Union, No. 194, my son, being then a member of that Union, introduced and, after some hard fighting, succeeded in carrying a resolution placing women compositors on a par in every respect with men. There was not at that time a single woman compositor in the State, to my son's knowledge; there is one now in Raleigh and two apprentices, who claimed and receive all the advantages that men applying for admission to the Union receive.

Mrs. C. Harris started the *South Atlantic* at Wilmington. The Misses Bernheim and their father started a magazine in the same city called *At Home and Abroad*, which was afterwards moved to Charlotte; both were short-lived. We have now the *Southern Woman*. This is the only journal ever edited and managed by a woman alone, with no man associated with or responsible for it. I have been for twenty years connected with the press of this State in one way and another, and am called the "Grandmother of the North Carolina Press Association." In 1880 I delivered an original poem before the association, and another Masonic one before the board of the orphan asylum; making me, I believe, the first native North Carolina woman that ever came before the public as a speaker. I was both denounced and applauded for my "brass" and "bravery." Public sentiment has changed since then.

Digitized by Google

Mrs. Marion A. Williams, president of the State National Bank at Raleigh for several years, is probably the first woman ever elected to that responsible position in any State of this Union. In 1885 Louisa B. Stephens was made president of the First National Bank of Marion, Iowa; and a national bank in Newbery, South Carolina, honored itself by placing a woman at the head of its official board.

The *North Carolinian* of January, 1870, contained an able editorial endorsing woman suffrage, closing with:

For one we say, tear down the barriers, give woman an opportunity to show her wisdom and virtue; place the ballot in her hands that she may protect herself and reform men, and ere a quarter of a century has elapsed many of the foulest blots upon the civilization of this age will have passed away.

From an interesting article in the *Boston Advertiser*, May 22, 1875, by Rev. James Freeman Clark, concerning Dr. Susan Dimock, one of North Carolina's promising daughters, whose career was ended in the wreck of the Schiller near the Scilly islands, we make a few extracts:

One of our eminent surgeons, Dr. Samuel Cabot, said to me yesterday:

"This community will never know what a loss it has had in Dr. Dimock. It was not merely her skill, though that was remarkable, considering her youth and limited experience, but also her nerve, that qualified her to become a great surgeon. I have seldom known one at once so determined and so self-possessed. Skill is a quality much more easily found than this self-control that nothing can flurry. She had that in an eminent degree; and, had she lived, she would have been sure to stand, in time, among those at the head of her profession. The usual weapons of ridicule would have been impotent against a woman who had reached that supreme position which Susan Dimock would certainly have attained."

During the war of the rebellion, Miss Dimock sought admission into the medical school of Harvard University, preferring, if possible, to take a degree in an American college. Twice she applied, and was twice refused. Hearing that the University of Zurich was open to women, she went there, and was received with a hospitality which the institutions of her own country did not offer. She pursued her medical studies there, and graduated with honor. A number of the "Revue des Deux Mondes" for August, 1872, contains an article called "Les Femmes à l'Universitie de Zurich," which speaks very favorably of the success of the women in that place. The first to take a degree as doctor of medicine was a young Russian lady, in 1867. Between 1867 and 1872 five others had taken this degree, and among them Miss Dimock is mentioned. From the medical school at Zurich, she went to that at Vienna; and of her appearance there we have this record: A distinguised German physician remarked to a friend of mine residing in Germany that he had always been opposed to women as physicians —but that he had met a young American lady studying at Vienna, whose intelligence, modesty and devotion to her work was such as almost to convince him that he was wrong. A comparison of dates shows that this American student must have been Dr. Dimock.

On her return to the United States Dr. Dimock became resident physician at "The Hospital for Women and Children," on Codman Avenue, in Boston. Both the students of medicine and the patients became devotedly attached to her; they were fascinated by this remarkable union of tenderness, firmness and skill. The secret was in part told by what she said in one of her lectures in the training-school for nurses connected with the woman's hospital: "I wish you, of all my instructions, especially to remember this. Where you go to nurse a patient, imagine that it is your own sister before you in that bed; and treat her as you would wish your own sister to be treated." While at this hospital, she was also able to carry out a principle in which she firmly believed, namely—that in a hospital the rights of every patient, poor and rich, should be sacredly regarded, and never be postponed even to the supposed interests of medical students. No student was allowed to be present at any operation, except so far as the comfort and safety of her patients rendered the student's presence desirable. Her

Digitized by Google

interest in the woman's hospital was very great. She was in the habit, at the beginning of each year, of writing and sealing up her wishes for the coming year. Since her death, her mother has opened the envelope of January 1, 1875, and found it to contain a prayer for a blessing on "my dear hospital."

And now this young, strong soul so ardent in the pursuit of knowledge, so filled with a desire to help her suffering sisters, has been taken by that remorseless deep.

IX.—South Carolina.

The first action we hear of in South Carolina was a Woman's Right's Convention in Columbia, Dec. 20, 1870, of which the Charleston *Republican* said:

The chairman, Miss Rollin, said: "It had been so universally the custom to treat the idea of woman suffrage with ridicule and merriment that it becomes necessary in submitting the subject for earnest deliberation that we assure the gentlemen present that our claim is made honestly and seriously. We ask suffrage not as a favor, not as a privilege, but as a right based on the ground that we are human beings, and as such, entitled to all human rights. While we concede that woman's ennobling influence should be confined chiefly to home and society, we claim that public opinion has had a tendency to limit woman's sphere to too small a circle, and until woman has the right of representation this will last, and other rights will be held by an insecure tenure."

Mr. T. J. Mackey made a forcible argument in favor of the movement. He was followed by Miss Hosley, who made a few brief remarks upon the subject. General Moses thought woman's introduction upon the political platform would benefit us much in a moral point of view, and that they had a right to assist in making the laws that govern them as well as the sterner sex. Messrs. Cardozo, Pioneer and Rev. Mr. Harris followed in short speeches, endorsing the movement and wishing it success. Resolutions were adopted, and officers chosen.* The following letters were read:

Executive Department, Columbia, Jan. 19, 1871.

Miss L. M. Rollin:—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your invitation to be present at the preliminary organization of the association for the assertion of woman's rights in this State, and regret that the pressure of public duties precludes my indulging myself in that pleasure. Be assured, however, that the cause has my warmest sympathy, and I indulge the hope that the time is not far distant when woman shall be the peer of man in political rights, as she is peerless in all others, and when she will be able to reclaim some of those privileges that are now monopolized by the sterner sex.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, etc., R. K. Scott, *Governor.*

Office of the Attorney-General, Columbia, Feb. 1, 1871.

I hoped when I received your invitation to the meeting to-night of the friends of woman suffrage, that I should be able to attend in person, but at a late hour I find other duties standing in the way, and I can only say a word of approval and encouragement with my pen. The woman suffrage cause is to my mind so just and so expedient as to need little argument. To say that my mother, my sisters or my wife have less interest in good government than I have, or are less fitted by nature to understand and use the ballot than I am, is to contradict reason and fact.

Upon the same grounds that I defend my own right to share in the government which controls and protects me, do I now assert the right of woman to a voice in public affairs. For the same reasons that I would regard an attempt to rob me of my civil rights as tyranny, do I now protest against the continued civil inequality and thralldom of woman. I take no merit or pride to myself for such a position. I have felt and said these things during my whole life. They are to me self-evident truths; needing

**President*, Gov. R. K. Scott; *Vice-Presidents*, Hon. B. F. Whittemore, Hon. G. F. McIntyre, Gen. W. J. Whipper, Mrs. R. C. DeLarge, Hon. D. H. Chamberlain, Mrs. A. J. Ransier, and Mrs. R. K. Scott; *Secretary*, Miss K. Rollin; *Treasurer*, Mrs. K. Harris.

Digitized by Google

no more demonstration by argument than the first lines of the Declaration of American Independence. My claim for woman is simply this: Give her a full and fair chance to act in any sphere for which she can fit herself. Her sphere is as wide as man's. It has no limits except her capacity. If woman cannot perform a soldier's duty, then the army is not her sphere; if she can, it is her sphere, as much as it is man's.

I value the ballot for woman chiefly because it opens to her a wide, free avenue to a complete development of all her powers. The Chinese lady's shoe is nothing compared to the clamps and fetters which we Americans have put upon woman's mind and soul. An impartial observer would scarcely condemn the one and approve the other. What we need now is to accustom the public to these radical truths. Demand the ballot; demand woman's freedom. It is not a conflict of argument or reason, so much as a crusade against habit and prejudice. To tell the truth, I don't think there is a respectable argument in the world against woman suffrage. People think they are arguing or reasoning against it when they are in fact only repeating the prejudices in which they have been trained. With the sincerest wishes for the success of your meeting and of all your efforts for woman suffrage, I remain, yours very truly,

D. H. CHAMBERLAIN.

The American association memorialized the legislature March 13, 1872. The joint committee recommended an amendment to the constitution of the State, providing that every person, male or female, possessed of the necessary qualifications, should be entitled to vote. B. F. Whittemore, H. J. Maxwell, W. B. Nash, G. F. McIntyre, were the committee on the part of the Senate; C. D. Hayne, W. J. Whipper, Benj. Byas, B. G. Yocom, F. H. Frost, committee on the part of the House.

In the debate in congress in 1874, Hon. Alonzo J. Ransier of South Carolina, the civil-rights bill being under discussion, claimed that equal human rights should be extended to women as follows:

And may the day be not far distant when American citizenship in civil and political rights and public privileges shall cover not only those of our sex, but those of the opposite one also; until which time the government of the United States cannot be said to rest upon the "consent of the governed," or to adequately protect them in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Miss Sallie R. Banks, for some years a teacher of colored schools in South Carolina, has been appointed collector of internal revenue for the Sumter district.

X.—FLORIDA.

In 1880, the agricultural department at Washington, paid a premium of $12 to Madame Atzeroth of Manatee, for the first pound of coffee ever grown out of doors in the United States.

The following is from a letter to the Savannah *News*, reporting a judgment rendered by a Florida county judge, in a case between an old black man and his wife:

OCALA, Fla., May 12, 1874.

Be it known throughout all christendom that the husband is the head of the wife, and whatever is his is his'n, and whatever is hers is his'n, and come weal or woe, peace or war, the right of all property is vested in the husband, and the wife must not take anything away. The ox belongs to Uncle Ben, and he must keep it, and the other things, and if the old woman quits she must go empty-handed. Know all that this is so by order of the Judge of Probate. [Signed] WM. R. HILLYER.

Though quaintly expressed, yet this decision is in line with the old common law and the statutes of many of the States in this Union to-day.

Digitized by Google

XI.—Alabama.

The women of Alabama are evidently awake on the temperance question, though still apparently unprepared for suffrage. In a report of a meeting in Birmingham in 1885, the following, from a prominent editor, was read by the president:

Tell the admirable lady, Mrs. Bryce, that I would devote everything to the cause she espouses, but there's no use. Let women demand the ballot, and with it they can destroy whisky, and by no other agency. There is no perfect family or state in which woman is not an active governing force. They should have the courage to assert themselves and then they can serve the country and the race.

If a thunderbolt had fallen it would not have created a greater sensation. The ladies at first grew indignant and uttered protestations. When they grew calmer, the corresponding secretary was ordered to furnish the editor with the following:

The ladies of the W. C. T. U. return thanks to the editor for his kindly and progressive suggestions, but, in their opinion, they are not ready to ask any political favors. Whenever suffrage is granted to the women of the United States, those of Alabama will be found on the right side.

At Huntsville lives Mrs. Priscilla Holmes Drake, whose name has stood as representative of our National Association in Alabama since 1868.

XII.—Georgia.

We give a letter from Georgia's great statesman, defining his views of woman's sphere:

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., May 29, 1878.

Mrs. E. L. Saxon, New Orleans, La.

My Dear Madam:—Your letter to Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, of the 22d inst., came duly to hand. He requests me to thank you for it, and to say in reply that he has ever sympathized with woman in her efforts for a higher and broader sphere of intellectual and moral culture, as well as physical usefulness in life. He does not go so far as to endow woman with the ballot, or to fit her for the more masculine duties of the State. Her sphere, by nature, is circumscribed within certain physical boundaries, but in all those things to which she is fitted by nature, and can enter without interference with the laws of God, he would open the doors wide to her.

Very respectfully yours, C. P. Culver, *Secretary.*

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LV. (CONCLUDED).

CANADA.

WE are indebted to Miss Phelps of St. Catharines and Mrs. Curzon of Toronto for the facts we give in regard to women's position in the Dominion. Miss Phelps says:

History tells us that when the thirteen American colonies revolted and their independence was declared there were 25,000 who adhered to the policy of King George, under the name of the United Empire Loyalists, some of whom came to Canada, others to Acadia and others wandered elsewhere. The 10,000 who sought a home in Canada at once formed a government in harmony with English laws and usages. Parliament was established in 1803 at York, now Toronto, and during that session the first law for the protection of married women was passed. At first, if a married woman desired to dispose of her property, she was obliged to go before the courts to testify as to her willingness to do so. In 1821 a bill was passed enabling her to go before justices of the peace. This was a great convenience, for the courts were not always in session when it was imperative for her to sell. In 1849 a bill was passed to naturalize women who married native-born or naturalized subjects. In 1859, under the old parliament of Canada, the Married Woman's Property act was passed, which in brief provides that every woman who may marry without any marriage-contract or settlement shall, after May 4, 1859, notwithstanding her coverture, have, hold and enjoy all her real estate, whether belonging to her before marriage or in any way acquired afterward, free from her husband's debts and obligations contracted after May 4, 1859. A married woman may also hold her personal property free from the debts and contracts of her husband, and obtain an order of protection for her own earnings and those of her minor children. She may become a stockholder of any bank, insurance company or any incorporated association, as if she were a *feme sole*, and may vote by proxy or otherwise. A married woman is liable on contracts respecting her own real estate. No married woman is liable to arrest either on mesne or final process. Any superior court of law or equity or any judge of said court, or a judge of a surrogate court, or deputy, may, on hearing the petition of a mother, or minor whose father is dead, appoint her as guardian—notwithstanding the appointment of another person by the father—of the estate to which the minor is entitled, and of such sums of money as are necessary from time to time for the maintenance of the minor. In 1881 a law was passed enabling a woman to discharge a mortgage on her lands without her husband being a party to it, while a husband cannot dispose of his property without her consent.

More than thirty years ago school suffrage was granted to women on the same grounds as to male electors, and they are eligible to all school offices. Women have, however, been slow to avail themselves of this privilege, owing to their ignorance of the laws and their lack of interest in regard to all public measures. When they awake to their political rights they will feel a deeper responsibility in the discharge of their public duties. But the steady increase in the number of those who avail themselves of this privilege is the one encouraging indication of the growth of the suffrage movement in Canada.

Digitized by Google

In 1882 the municipal act was so amended as to give married women, widows and spinsters, if possessed of the necessary qualifications, the right to vote on by-laws and some other minor municipal matters. Again, in 1884, the act was still further amended, extending the right to vote at municipal elections to widows and unmarried women on all matters. In Toronto, January 4, 1886, the women polled a large vote, resulting in the election of the candidate pledged to reform. But it must be remembered that this progressive legislation belongs only to the Province of Ontario.

Mrs. Curzon writes:

In the year 1876 Dr. Emily H. Stowe—graduated in New York—settled in Toronto for the practice of her profession. Thoroughly imbued with the principles roughly summed up in the term "woman's rights," and finding that her native Canada was not awake to the importance of the subject, she lectured in the principal towns of Ontario on "Woman's Sphere and Woman in Medicine." By reason of the agitation caused by these lectures a Woman's Literary Club * was organized in Toronto with Dr. Stowe, president, and Miss Helen Archibald, secretary. The triumphs scored through the efforts of this club were the admission of women to the University College and School of Medicine of Toronto, Queen's University and the Royal Medical School of Kingston, and the founding of a medical school for women in each city. When the municipal franchise was granted to women the club decided to come out boldly as a suffrage organization. Accordingly by resolution the Toronto Woman's Literary Club was dissolved and the Canadian Woman Suffrage Association † formed, March 9, 1883.

McGill University at Montreal has an annex for women founded through the munificence of one of the merchants of that city.——Dalhousie College, Halifax, admits women on the same footing as men. The Toronto *Mail* says it is only a question of time when all Canadian colleges will do the same thing.——In 1883 the provincial legislature of Nova Scotia gave duly qualified women the right to vote, and they exercised it very generally the following year.——In New Brunswick the old laws and prejudices remain, but woman suffrage has its friends and advocates in Mrs. E. W. Fisher and Mr. and Mrs. W. Frank Hathaway of St. Johns.——In 1885 the Mount Allison Methodist College at Sackville, N. B., conferred the degree of M. A. on Miss Harriet Stewart. This is the first instance of an educational institution in the Dominion conferring such an honor upon a lady.

---

* *The Ballot-Box* in 1880 said: "*The Citizen* of Toronto, Ont., has established a 'Ladies' Column' under the auspices of the Toronto Woman's Literary Club, the first ladies' club ever formed in Canada. This club has been in existence four years. *The Citizen* is said to be the first Canadian paper devoted, even in part, to woman's interest. Heading this change 'Important Notice,' it says: 'We have great pleasure in announcing that we have made an arrangement with the Toronto Woman's Literary Club to occupy an important space in our columns, for the advance of moral, social, educational and family matters affecting woman generally. Mrs. S. A. Curzon has charge of this column as associate editor.' The club in a stirring salutatory defines its work and objects. It is the intention to give, each week, a *résumé* of the current topics concerning women, education, the franchises, the legal abilities and disabilities of women, etc., hoping to arouse a national sentiment among Canadian women and intelligence upon these important subjects. This appeal is signed by Mrs. McEwen, the president, and Emily H. Stowe, Mrs. W. J. MacKenzie, Mrs. W. B. Hamilton and Mrs. S. A. Curzon, the executive committee."

† The officers were: *President*, Mrs. Donald McEwen; *Vice-Presidents*, Mrs. Curzon, Mrs. E. H. Stowe, M. D., Captain W. F. McMaster, John Hallam, esq.; *Treasurer*, Mrs. W. B. Hamilton; *Secretary*, Miss J. Foulds; *Executive Committee*, Mrs. McKenzie, Mrs. S. McMaster, Mrs. Riches, Mrs. Miller, Miss Hamilton, Miss McMaster, Miss Alexander, William Houston, J. L. Foulds, P. McIntyre, Phillips Thompson, Thomas Bengough.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1934 L

Mentia Taylor

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LVI.

GREAT BRITAIN.

BY CAROLINE ASHURST BIGG.

[illegible] Members to Parliament [illegible]
[illegible] Jeffrey [illegible]
[illegible] Mayoral [illegible]
[illegible]—Associations formed in London, [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] the Suffrage Bill—[illegible] Bright [illegible]
Memorial of the National Society—Some Account [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]—Bristol—Nottingham—Birmingham—[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] of Adverse Majority [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible] of the work in Suffrage movement, it [illegible]
[illegible] John Stuart Mill [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] in England. As [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] Elizabeth, showing [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Digitized by Google

Mentia Taylor

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LVI.

GREAT BRITAIN.

BY CAROLINE ASHURST BIGGS.

Women Send Members to Parliament—Sidney Smith, Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden—The Ladies of Oldham—Jeremy Bentham—Anne Knight—Northern Reform Society, 1858—Mrs. Matilda Biggs—Unmarried Women and Widows Petition Parliament—Associations formed in London, Manchester, Edinburgh, 1867—John Stuart Mill in Parliament—Seventy-three Votes for his Bill—John Bright's Vote—Women Register and Vote—Lord-Chief-Justice of England Declares their Constitutional Right—The Courts give Adverse Decisions—Jacob Bright secures the Municipal Franchise—First Public Meeting—Division on Jacob Bright's Bill to Remove Political Disabilities—Mr. Gladstone's Speech—Work of 1871-2—Fourth Vote on the Suffrage Bill—Jacob Bright fails of Reëlection—Efforts of Mr. Forsyth—Memorial of the National Society—Some Account of the Workers—Vote of the New Parliament, 1875—Organized Opposition—Diminished Adverse Vote of 1878—Mr. Courtney's Resolution—Letters—Great Demonstrations at Manchester—London—Bristol—Nottingham—Birmingham—Sheffield—Glasgow—Victory in the Isle of Man—Passage of Municipal Franchise Bill for Scotland—Mr. Mason's Resolution—Reduction of Adverse Majority to 16—Conference at Leeds—Mr. Woodall's Amendment to Reform Bill of 1884—Meeting at Edinburgh—Other Meetings—Estimated Number of Women Householders—Circulars to Members of Parliament—Debate on the Amendment—Resolutions of the Society—Further Debate—Defeat of the Amendment—Meeting at St. James Hall—Conclusion.

In writing a history of the woman suffrage movement, it is difficult to say where one should begin, for although the organized agitation which arose when John Stuart Mill first brought forward his proposal in parliament dates back only eighteen years, the foundations for this demand were laid with the very earliest parliamentary institutions in England. As a nation we are fond of working by precedents, and it is a favorite saying among lawyers that modern English law began with Henry III. In earlier Saxon times women who were freeholders of lands or burgesses in towns had the same electoral rights as men. We have records of the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth, showing that ladies of the manse, in their own right, sent members to parliament. Down to the time of the civil wars women were accustomed to share in the election of "parliament men." In 1640, some women voted in an elec-

Digitized by Google

tion for the county of Suffolk, Sir Simonds d'Ewes being high-sheriff:

> Who, as soon as he had notice thereof, sent to forbid the same, conceiving it a matter verie unworthy of anie gentleman, and most dishonourable in such an election to make use of their voices, although in law they might have been allowed.

The spirit of the Puritans was not favorable to woman's equality; but, though disused, the right was never absolutely taken away by law. In a celebrated trial, Olive *vs.* Ingram (reign of George II.) the chief-justice gave it as his opinion that "a person paying scot and lot," and therefore qualified to vote, was a description which included women; and all the writs of election down to the time of William IV. were made to "persons" who were freeholders. However, for all purposes of political life this right was as good as dead, being absolutely forgotten. But still the local franchises remained. We have no data to determine whether these were as completely neglected as the parliamentary franchise. Parishioners voted for overseers of the poor and for other local boards; and women were never legally disqualified from voting in these elections. The lowest period in the condition of women appears to have been reached at the end of the last century, though they were not then indifferent to politics. "You cannot," says Miss Edgeworth's Lady Davenant, "satisfy yourself with the common namby-pamby phrase, 'Ladies have nothing to do with politics.' * * * Female influence must exist on political subjects as well as on all others; but this influence should always be domestic not public; the customs of society have so ruled it." This sentence exactly represented ordinary English feeling. It was never considered derogatory to an English lady to take an active part in elections, provided she did so for some member of her family; but of direct responsibility she had none.

In the ferment of opinion which preceded the great Reform bill, woman's claim to participate in it was never heard. The new franchises which were then for the first time created applied exclusively to *male* persons, but in the old franchises continuing in force, the word "person" alone is strictly used. Mr. Sidney Smith said:

> In reserving and keeping alive the qualifications in existence before those itself created, this statute falls back exactly to the accustomed phraseology of the earlier acts. Whenever it confers a new right it restricts it to every male person. Whenever it perpetuates existing fran-

Digitized by Google

chises, it continues them to every person, leaving the word "male" out on system.

This may have been little more than an oversight, or it may have been that respect for precedent which used to be an inherent quality in English statesmen. But it is curious that the first petition ever, to our knowledge, presented for women's suffrage to the House of Commons should date from this same year. It was presented on August 3, 1832, and is the worthy predecessor of many thousands in later times. Hansard thus describes it:

Mr. Hunt said he had a petition to present which might be a subject of mirth to some honorable gentlemen, but which was one deserving of consideration. It came from a lady of rank and fortune, Mary Smith of Stanmore, in the county of York. The petition stated that she paid taxes, and therefore did not see why she should not have a share in the election of a representative; she also stated that women were liable to all the penalties of the law, even death, and ought to have a voice in the fixing of them; but so far from this, on their trials both judges and jurors were of the opposite sex. She could see no good reason for the exclusion of women from political rights while the highest office of the State, that of the crown, was open to the inheritance of females; and, so we understood, the petitioner expressed her indignation against those vile wretches who would not marry, and yet would exclude females from a share in the legislation. The prayer of the petition was that every unmarried female, possessing the necessary pecuniary qualifications, should be entitled to vote for members of parliament.

The following year Sir Robert Peel in opposing vote by ballot said:

The theoretical arguments in favor of woman suffrage were at least as strong as those in favor of vote by ballot. There were arguments in favor of extending the franchise to women to which it was no easy matter to find a logical answer. Other and more important duties were entrusted to women. Women were allowed to hold property, to vote on many occasions in right of that property; nay, a woman might inherit the throne and perform all the functions of the first office of the State. Why should they not vote for a member of parliament?

But Sir Robert Peel evidently had no idea that a time would come when women would ask this question in downright seriousness. Meanwhile the preference for the words "male person" in the new enactments still continued. It was employed in the Municipal Corporation Reform act, 1835; and in the Irish poor-law act of 1838, women, as well as clergymen, were expressly excluded from election as poor-law guardians. The repeal of the corn-laws brought the political work of women to the front; they formed local committees, collected funds and attended meetings.

Digitized by Google

In a speech on free-trade, delivered in Covent Garden Theater January 15, 1845, Richard Cobden said:

There are many ladies present, I am happy to say; now, it is a very anomalous fact that they cannot vote themselves, and yet that they have a power of conferring votes upon other people. I wish they had the franchise, for they would often make much better use of it than their husbands.

Again in 1848, in supporting a motion of Mr. Joseph Hume in the House of Commons to the effect that the elective franchise should be extended to all householders, Mr. Cobden said:

A gentleman asked me to support universal suffrage on the ground of principle, and I said to him, if it is a principle that a man should have a vote because he pays taxes, why should not a widow who pays taxes and is liable to serve as church-warden and overseer, have a vote for members of parliament? The gentleman replied that he agreed with me.

In 1853, Mr. W. J. Fox, member for Oldham, in acknowledging the presentation to him by the ladies of Oldham of a signet-ring bearing the inscription, "Education, the birthright of all," spoke strongly in favor of women having a definite share in political life:

If women have nothing to do with politics, honest men ought to have nothing to do with politics. They keep us pure, simple, just, earnest, in our exertions in politics and public life. They have to do with it, because while the portion of man may be by the rougher labors of the head and hands to work out many of the great results of life, the peculiar function of woman is to spread grace and softness, truth, beauty, benignity over all. Nor is woman confined to this. In fact I wish that her direct as well as indirect influence were still larger than it is in the sphere of politics. Why, we trust a woman with the sceptre of the realm, consider her adequate to make peers in the State and bishops in the Church; surely she must be adequate to send her representatives to the lower House. I know the time may not have come for mooting a question of this sort: but I know the time will come, and that woman will be something more than a mere adjective to man in political matters. She will become a substantive also. And why not?

Other speakers and writers brought forward the same point. Jeremy Bentham declared he could find no reasons for the exclusion of women, though he laid no stress on the matter; Herbert Spencer in "Social Statics" (1851), Mr. Thomas Hare in his book on "Representation," and Mr. Mill in "Representative Government," all discussed it. In 1843 Mrs. Hugo Reid published an excellent volume, "A Plea for Woman," in which she maintained that "There is no good ground for the assumption that the possession and exercise of political privileges are

Digitized by Google

incompatible with home duties." In 1841 a strong article appeared in the *Westminster Review*, written by Mrs. Margaret Mylne, a Scotch lady still living. Mrs. Stuart Mill's admirably comprehensive article appeared in the same review in 1851.* In 1846, also, Col. T. Perronet Thompson, the well-known anti-corn-law advocate, wrote:

Whenever the popular party can agree upon and bring forward any plan which shall include the equal voting of women, they will not only obtain an alliance of which most men know the importance, but they will relieve the theory of universal suffrage from the stigma its enemies never fail to draw upon it, of making its first step a wholesale disqualification of half the universe concerned.

Among other writers and speakers on the subject, we must also enumerate Anne Knight, an earnest warm-hearted Quaker lady. She sometimes lectured upon it, and many of her letters written to Mrs. Elizabeth Pease Nichol of Edinburgh, Lord Brougham, and others, are still preserved, in which she eagerly advocates the admission of women to the suffrage. She assisted in founding the Sheffield Female Political Association. On February 26, 1851, this association held a meeting at the Democratic Temperance Hotel, Sheffield, and unanimously adopted an address, which was the first manifesto dealing with the suffrage ever formulated by a meeting of women in England:

ADDRESS OF THE SHEFFIELD POLITICAL ASSOCIATION TO THE WOMEN OF ENGLAND—*Beloved Sisters:* We, the women of the democracy of Sheffield, beg the indulgence of addressing you at this important juncture. We have been observers for a number of years of the various plans and systems of organization which have been laid down for the better government and guidance of democracy, and we are brought to the conclusion that women might with the strictest propriety be included in the proclamation of the people's charter; for we are the majority of the nation, and it is our birth-right, equally with our brother, to vote for the man who is to sway our political destiny, to impose the taxes which we are compelled to pay, to make the laws which we with others must observe; and heartily should we rejoice to see the women of England uniting for the purpose of demanding this great right of humanity, feeling assured that were women thus comprehended, they would be the greatest auxiliaries of right against might. For what would not the patient, energetic mind of woman accomplish, when once resolved? The brave and heroic deeds which history records are our testimony that no danger is too great, no struggle too arduous for her to encounter; thus confirming

* This was called out by the movement in America. A report of a convention held in Worcester, Mass., published in the New York *Tribune*, fell into the hands of Mrs. Taylor and aroused her to active thought on the question. She comments on a very able series of resolutions passed at this convention, in which such men as Emerson, Parker, Channing, Garrison and Phillips took part.—[EDITORS.

Digitized by Google

our convictions that woman's cooperation is greatly needed for the accomplishment of our political well-being. But there are some who would say: "Would you have woman enjoy all the political rights of men?" To this we emphatically answer: Yes! for does she not toil early and late in the factory, and in every department of life subject to the despotism of men? and we ask in the name of justice, must we continue ever the silent and servile victims of this injustice? perform all the drudgery of his political societies and never possess a single political right? Is the oppression to last forever? We, the women of the democracy of Sheffield, answer, No! We put forth this earnest appeal to our sisters of England to join hand and heart with us in this noble and just cause, to the exposing and eradicating of such a state of things. Let us shake off our apathy and raise our voices for right and liberty, till justice in all its fulness is conceded to us. This we say to all who are contending for liberty, for what is liberty if the claims of women be disregarded? Our special object will be the entire political enfranchisement of our own sex; and we conjure you, our sisters of England, to aid us in accomplishing this holy work. We remain with heartfelt respect, your friends.*

At the end of 1858 there was established in Newcastle-on-Tyne an association called the Northern Reform Society, which had universal suffrage for its object, and it expressly invited the contributions of women. Letters were written by Matilda Ashurst Biggs, and afterwards by two or three women in different parts of the country, offering to become members. In acknowledging these letters, the secretary stated that the Northern Reform Union only contemplated the extension of the franchise to men, although he admitted that many of its leading members were individually in favor of "woman suffrage" but they believed that by asking for manhood suffrage, they were advancing a step towards universal franchise. He added, "The society will be very glad of women's subscriptions, and trusts that they will use their best efforts to promote its extension." Undoubtedly, there has never been any reluctance to accept the subscriptions of women towards promoting the objects of men. In commenting upon this letter, Mrs. Biggs † said in the *Newcastle Guardian*, February 19, 1859:

---

* *Council of the Association*—Mrs. S. Turner, Mrs. S. Bartholomew, Mrs. E. Stephenson, Mrs. M. Whalley, Mrs. E. Rooke, Mrs. E. Wade, Mrs. C. Ash, president *pro tem.*, Mrs. E. Cavill, treasurer, Mrs. M. Brook, financial secretary, Mrs. A. Higginbottom, corresponding secretary.

† Mrs. Biggs, Anna Knight, Mrs. Hugo Reid and many other English women were roused to white heat on this question, by the exclusion of women as delegates from the World's Anti-slavery Convention held in London in 1840. That was the first pronounced public discussion, lasting one entire day, on the whole question of woman's rights that ever took place in England, and as the arguments were reproduced in the leading journals and discussed at every fireside, a grand educational work was inaugurated at that time. The American delegates spent several months in England—Lucretia Mott speaking at many points. She occupied the Unitarian pulpit in London and elsewhere. As Mrs. Hugo Reid sat in this convention throughout the proceedings and met Lucretia Mott socially on several occasions, we may credit her outspoken opinions, in 1843, in a measure to these influences.—[EDITORS.

Digitized by Google

I have never given my rights to be merged in those of any other person, and I feel it an injustice that I, who am equally taxed with men, should be denied a voice in making the laws which affect and dispose of my property, and made to support a State wherein I am not recognized as a citizen. I consider that a tyranny which renders me responsible to laws in the making of which I am not consulted. The Northern Reform Society, which "takes its stand upon justice," should claim for us at least that we be exempted from the duties, if we are to be denied the rights belonging to citizens.

These books, speeches and letters though scattered and unconnected, slowly prepared the ground for the organized agitation. Another Reform bill grew into preparation. Men's thoughts were turned again towards the question of representation, and every word spoken on behalf of the enfranchisement of women assumed double force as it drew near to a political issue. The enfranchisement of women advanced from a question of philosophical speculation to actual politics in the election of John Stuart Mill member of parliament for Westminster in 1865. In his election address, Mr. Mill, as previously in his work on representative government, openly avowed this article of political faith. Nevertheless, the first speech of which we have record in the House of Commons plainly vindicating the right of women to the vote, was that of a man who differed from Mr. Mill in every other feature of his political life and creed—Mr. Disraeli. He used almost the same form of argument as Sir Robert Peel had done thirty years before, but unlike the former statesman he backed it up with his vote and personal influence for many succeeding years. It was in 1866 that he spoke these words, long and gratefully remembered by the women of the country:

In a country governed by a woman—where you allow woman to form part of the estate of the realm—peeresses in their own right for example—where you allow a woman not only to hold land, but to be a lady of the manor and hold legal courts—where a woman by law may be a churchwarden and overseer of the poor,—I do not see, where she has so much to do with the State and Church, on what reasons, if you come to right, she has not a right to vote.

These words from Disraeli were the spark that fired the train. In answer to a request from Miss Jessie Boucherett, Mrs. Bodichon and Miss Bessie R. Parkes, Mr. Mill replied that if they could find a hundred women who would sign a petition for the franchise, he would present it to the House of Commons. A committee was immediately formed in London, and the petition was circulated. In two or three weeks it had received 1,499

Digitized by Google

signatures. Among these were many who in after years took a prominent part, not only in suffrage, but in other movements for the elevation of women. The petition was presented by Mr. Mill in May, 1866, and was received with laughter. He then gave notice of a motion to introduce into the Reform bill a provision to the same effect. The committee* immediately began to circulate petitions and pamphlets. Two of these were by Mrs. Bodichon, "Reasons for, and Objections against the Enfranchisement of Women," being the substance of a paper she had read at the Social Science Congress, in October, 1866. We give the text of the petition, as it differed somewhat from those circulated in after years:

To the Honorable, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled:

The humble petition of the undersigned,—showeth, That your petitioners fulfill the conditions of property or rental prescribed by law as the qualification of the electoral franchise, and exercise in their own names the rights pertaining to such conditions; that the principles in which the government of the United Kingdom is based, imply the representation of all classes and interests in the State; that the reasons alleged for withholding the franchise from certain classes of her majesty's subjects do not apply to your petitioners. Your petitioners therefore humbly pray your honorable House to grant to such persons as fulfill all the conditions which entitle to a vote in the election of members of parliament, excepting only that of sex, the privilege of taking part in the choice of fit persons to represent the people in your honorable House.

This form of petition was only signed by unmarried women and widows of full age, holding the legal qualification for voting in either county or borough, but there were other forms for other classes of persons. On March 28, the Right Hon. H. A. Bruce presented a petition from 3,559 persons, mostly women. Mr. Mill, in April, presented one with 3,161 names collected by the Manchester committee, and the Right Hon. Russell Gurney one signed by 1,605 qualified women, *i. e.*, free-holders and house-

* The committee as at first formed, consisted of the following persons: The very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. Alford, Miss Jessie Boucherett, Professor Cairnes, Rev. W. L. Clay, Miss Davies, the originator of Girton College, Lady Goldsmid, Mr. G. W. Hastings, Mr. James Heywood, Mrs. Knox, Miss Manning, and Mrs. Hensleigh Wedgwood. Mrs. Peter A. Taylor was treasurer, and Mrs. J. W. Smith, *nee* Miss Garrett, honorary secretary. A few months later Mrs. Smith's death left this post vacant, and Mrs. P. A. Taylor then assumed the office of secretary which she retained with the aid of Miss Caroline Ashurst Biggs till 1871. No one else could have rendered such services to our movement while it was in its infancy as Mrs. Taylor gave. Her gentle and dignified presence, her untiring energy, the experience of organization and public life which she already possessed, her influence with an extended circle of friends chosen from among the most liberal thinkers of the nation, secured at once attention and respect for any cause she took up. Many years before she had worked hard for the association of the Friends of Italy, and on the breaking out of the American civil war her sympathies and practical knowledge led her to found a society for assisting the freedmen. In acknowledgment of the invaluable assistance she rendered, her friends in America sent a book containing a complete set of photographs of all the chief anti-slavery workers. When she began her efforts for women's suffrage, the English Abolitionists were among the first correspondents to whom she applied, and they nearly all responded cordially. For years her house, Aubrey House, Kensington, was the centre of the London organization to which she gave her time, strength, and money, well earning the title of "Mother of the Movement," which loving friends have since bestowed.

Digitized by Google

holders who would have had the vote had they been men. In all 13,497 were counted in the parliamentary report this session; among these were many clergymen, barristers, physicians and fellows of colleges.

While we are on the subject of petitions we may as well briefly glance at what was done in this branch of work during succeeding years.* No better method could be found of testing public opinion, or of affording scope for quiet, intelligent agitation. Many friends could help by circulating petitions, distributing literature at the same time and arguing away objections. In 1868 there were presented 78 petitions with nearly 50,000 signatures. One of them, headed by Mrs. Somerville and Florence Nightingale, contained 21,000 names, and was a heavy but delightful burden which Mr. Mill could hardly carry to the table. This petition excited great attention. During all these years no petitions were presented against granting the suffrage to women. These numbers were undoubtedly a surprise to many members of parliament who were inclined to look upon woman suffrage as an "impracticable fad," "the fantastic crochet of a few shrieking sisters." But the collection and arrangement of the signatures took up incalculable time, and after a few years this method of agitation was discarded to a great extent in the large political centres. Friends became wearied out with the toilsome process of year by year collecting signatures, which when presented were silently and indifferently dropped into the bag under the table of the House of Commons. But during the early days of the movement these petitions, signed by all classes of men and women, were invaluable in arousing interest in our movement.

In 1867, for the better prosecution of the work, instead of one committee embracing the whole of England, separate associations were formed in London, Manchester and Edinburgh. The London committee consisted of ladies only, Miss Frances Power Cobbe, Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Hampson, Miss Hare, Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. Stansfeld, with Mrs. Taylor as secretary. In the Manchester committee Mr. Jacob Bright, M. P., at once took up the position of leader and advocate which he afterwards so long and nobly maintained in the House of Commons. Miss Becker

* In 1869, 255 petitions, signed by 61,475 persons; in 1870, 663 petitions, signed by 134,561 persons; in 1871, 622 petitions, signed by 186,976 persons (75 of these petitions were from public meetings and signed only by the chairman, or from town councils and sealed with the official seal); in 1872, 829 petitions with 350,093 signatures; in 1873, 919 petitions, with 329,206 signatures; in 1874, 1,494 petitions, with 430,343 signatures; and in 1875, 1,273 petitions were sent in containing 415,622 signatures.

Digitized by Google

was appointed secretary. The Edinburgh committee elected Mrs. McLaren* for their president. At a special general meeting, November 6, 1867, it was resolved that these three societies should form one national society, thus securing the advantages of coöperation while maintaining freedom of action. The same rule applied to societies in Birmingham, Bristol and other towns.

To return to the debate in the House of Commons on May 20, 1867. on clause 4 of the Representation of the People bill. Mr. Mill moved to leave out the word "man" and insert the word "person." His speech has been too long before the public to need quotation; it is a model of inductive reasoning and masterly eloquence. The debate which followed was very unequal in character, but the division was gratifying, for he received 73 votes (including pairs, 81); 194 voted against him. Mr. Mill wrote afterwards to a friend:

> We are all delighted at the number of our minority, which is far greater than anybody expected the first time, and would have been greater still had not many members quitted the House, with or without pairing, in the expectation that the subject would not come on. But the greatest triumph of all was John Bright's vote.

At the election for Manchester, held near the end of 1867 (when Mr. Jacob Bright was elected), Lily Maxwell, whose name had been accidentally left on the parliamentary register, recorded her vote. No objection was taken to it by the returning officer, or by the agents of either candidate. The *Times* devoted a leading article to it. The circumstance was of no legal value, but it was useful to show that a woman could go through the process of recording a vote in a parliamentary election even before the Ballot act was passed. The idea gained ground that by the new Reform act the right to vote had been secured to women. The Reform act of 1867, sec. 3, declares that:

> Every man shall in and after the year 1868 be entitled to be registered as a voter, and when registered, to vote for a member to serve in parliament.

In the substitution of the word "man" for that of "male person" in the Reform act of 1832, a great difference was already

* This lady, sister of John and Jacob Bright, and wife of the senior member for Edinburgh, Mr. Duncan McLaren, so much esteemed that he was sometimes spoken of as the "Member for Scotland," unites in her own person all the requisites for a leader of the movement. She has the charm and dignified grace so generally found among Quaker ladies, and the pathetic eloquence which belong to her family. She is clear-sighted in planning action, and enthusiastic and warm-hearted in carrying it out, and for the past sixteen years the movement in Scotland has centered around her.

Digitized by Google

discernable, but this difference was more important when taken into conjunction with what was popularly known as "Lord Romilly's act," an act for shortening the language used in acts of parliament (13 and 14 Vict.). This act provides, "that all words importing the masculine gender shall be deemed and taken to include females, unless the contrary is expressly provided"; and in the Representation of the People act there was no express provision to the contrary. This had been pointed out by one or two members at the time.

Accordingly the several societies united in a systematic endeavor to procure the insertion of women's names on the registers of electors under the new Reform act. A circular respectfully requesting the boards of overseers to insert on the list of voters the names of all persons who had paid their rates, was sent to several hundred boards in different parts of the country. Very few replies were received, but women were placed on the lists in many counties, in Aberdeen, Salford and many small districts in Lancaster, Middlesex, Kent, etc. The overseers of Manchester declined compliance. In that city there were 5,100 women householders who claimed their votes, and when the revision courts were opened in September, this claim came on for consideration. The case was ably argued, but the revising barrister decided against admitting it, granting, however, a case for trial at the Court of Common Pleas. Another case was also granted, being that of Mrs. Kyllman, a free-holder, her claim being under the old free-holding franchise 8 Henry VI., to wit.:

> Elections of knights of the shire shall be made in each county by people dwelling and resident therein of whom each has free-hold to the value of £40 by the year.

In the majority of districts the revising barristers disallowed the claims; but in four district-revision courts the women's names were admitted. In Finsbury, one of the metropolitan boroughs, Mr. Chisholm Anstey was revising barrister, and he admitted them on account of ancient English law; in Cockermouth, Winterton and two townships of Lancashire, the revising barrister admitted them upon his interpretation of the Reform act taken in conjunction with Lord Romilly's act. In the suffrage report for this year the number of women placed on the electoral roll by these decisions is estimated at about 230, but undoubtedly there were others concerning whom no information was received. In many cases the women voted: 15 did so in

Digitized by Google

Finsbury (not only was there no disturbance, but hardly any remark was made, and they expressed their surprise that it was so easy a thing to do); 12 in Gordon and 10 in Levenshulme, both little districts in Lancashire, and smaller numbers in other places. In Chester the parliament candidate issued his election placards to "Ladies and Gentlemen."

On November 7, the case of the 5,000 Manchester women householders was argued before the Court of Common Pleas. Mr. J. D. Coleridge (now Lord Coleridge, Lord-chief-justice of England) and Dr. Pankhurst were the counsel for the appellants. Mr. John Coleridge in an able argument spoke of the ancient constitutional right of women to take part in elections. He produced copies from the record office of several indentures returning members to parliament, the signatures of which were in the hand-writing of women, or to which women were parties. He argued that the term "man" in the Reform act included woman, not only generally but specifically, under the provisions of Lord Romilly's act. The case was argued before Lord-chief-justice Boville; the decision was given on November 9, and decisively pronounced that the new Reform act had never intended to include women, and that they were incapacitated from voting. This decision did not affect the women who were already on the register, and many voted in the general election which took place afterwards. Thus women have been shut out from electoral rights, not by any decree of parliament, but by this decision of the Court of Common Pleas. However there was no appeal from this Court, except to parliament, and from this time forward the character of the agitation changed. The year 1868 ended with a legal decision which seemed crushing in its finality, while the same year had given the most conclusive proof that women wished to vote, and would do so whenever the opportunity offered.

The next year, 1869, gave another convincing proof that women were eager to vote, and brought us the most substantial triumph yet obtained, due to the wisdom and skilful tactics of Mr. Jacob Bright, member of parliament for Manchester. This victory was the municipal franchise for women. Early in 1869 Mr. Hibbert introduced a bill to regulate the conditions of the municipal franchise. By the Municipal Corporation Amendment act, passed in 1835, male persons only were authorized to vote. The present bill was to amend that. Mr. Jacob Bright, seconded by Sir

Digitized by Google

Charles Dilke and Mr. Peter Rylands, proposed the omission of the word "male" from the bill, and the insertion of a clause securing to women the right of voting in municipal elections. Mr. Hibbert concurred in the introduction of these amendments, though he did not anticipate they would lead to any result beyond a discussion. A circular containing full information upon the ancient and existing rights of women to vote in local affairs was sent to each member of parliament by the Manchester committee. It showed that before the passing of the Municipal Corporation act of 1835, women rate-payers had rights similar to those of men in all matters pertaining to local government and expenditure; and that in non-corporate districts they still exercised such rights, under the provisions of the Public Health act, and other statutes guarding the electoral privileges of the whole body of rate-payers. But when any district was incorporated into a municipal borough, the women rate-payers were disfranchised, although those not included within its boundaries remained possessed of votes. It showed also that women can vote in parochial matters, and take part in vestry meetings, called for various purposes, such as the election of church-wardens and way-wardens, the appointment of overseers, the sale of parish property, and, formerly, the levying of church-rates; also that they can vote in the election of poor-law guardians—that in fact, in none of those ancient voting customs, was the sex of the rate-payers taken into consideration as either a qualification or disqualification. We quote from the Manchester society:

In the House of Commons on June 7, 1869, on consideration of the Municipal Franchise bill as amended, Mr. Jacob Bright rose to move that in this act and the said recited act (Municipal Corporation Reform act, 1835) wherever words occur which import the masculine gender, the same shall be held to include females for all purposes connected with and having reference to the election of or power to elect representatives of any municipal corporation. He stated that his object was to give the municipal vote to every rate-payer within the municipal limits; to give to municipal property the representation which all property enjoyed elsewhere; that had the proposition been an innovation, a departure from the customary legislation of the country, he would not have brought it in as an amendment to a bill; but that his object was to remove an innovation —to resist one of the most remarkable invasions of long-established rights which the legislation of this or any other country could show. The bill before the house was an amendment of the Municipal Corporation act of 1835. That act was the only act in regard to local expenditure and local government which established this disability. Before and since, all acts

Digitized by Google

of parliament gave every local vote to every rate-payer. The Health of Towns act of 1848 had a clause almost identical with the one he was moving. He was therefore asking the House not only to make the bill in harmony with the general legislation of the country, but to allow it to be in harmony with its latest expressed convictions as shown in the act of 1848. There were in England 78 non-corporate towns which were not parliamentary boroughs, with populations varying from 20,000 to 6,000. In these every rate-payer voted. There was little if any difference between their government and that of municipal towns. Who could assign a reason why women should vote in one and not in the other? Every parochial vote was in the hands of the whole body of rate-payers. Women held the most important parochial offices. The sister of the member for Stockport had acted as overseer. Miss Burdett Coutts had been urged to take the office of guardian. Had she been a large rate-payer in a municipal town, what an absurdity to shut her out from the vote! He then showed how the process of disfranchisement was going on, and quoted Darlington and Southport. The latter town was incorporated in 1867. In 1866, 2,085 persons were qualified to vote for commissioners; 588 of these were women. From the moment of incorporation these votes were extinguished without a reason being assigned, though they had exercised them from time immemorial. Such would be the case with any town incorporated in the future. He appealed to the metropolitan members, and showed them that unless his clauses were carried, when they came to establish corporations throughout the metropolis, as some of them desired, all the female rate-payers would be struck off the roll; that over a population of 3,000,000 this exclusion would prevail. He stated that where women had the vote they exercised it to an equal degree with the men. Mr. Lings, the comptroller for the city of Manchester, affirms that according to his experience the number of men and women who vote in local affairs bears a just proportion to the number of each on the register. He showed that as the bill was a largely enfranchising measure, his clause was in strict harmony with it, but that while the bill sought to increase the representation of those who were already considerably represented, the clause which he wished to add would give representation to those who within municipal towns were totally deprived of it. He concluded by saying that questions had come to him, since these amendments had been on the paper, from women in different parts of the country, and from those who by their social and intellectual positions might be regarded as representatives of their sex, asking why there should always be this tender regard for the representation and therefore the protection of men, and this apparent disregard for the interest of women; and he appealed to the House, by its decision, to show that as regards these local franchises it had a common regard for the whole body of rate-payers.

Mr. Jacob Bright's motion, which he supported with all the tact, earnestness and judgment of which he afterwards gave such repeated proofs in bringing forward his Women's Disabilities bill, was seconded by Mr. Rylands. Mr. Bruce (the home secretary)

Digitized by Google

said he had shown conclusively that this proposition was no novelty, and that women were allowed to vote in every form of local government, except under the Municipal Corporations act. The clause introduced no anomaly, and he should give it his cordial support. Mr. Hibbert also supported the clause, which was agreed to amid cheers, and it was passed without a dissentient word or the faintest shadow of opposition, as was also the proposal of Sir Charles Dilke, to leave out the word "male" in the first clause.

In the House of Lords an attempt was made by Lord Redesdale to reverse the decision of the House of Commons, but the proposal found no seconder, and therefore fell to the ground. The Earl of Kimberley, on behalf of the government, supported the proposition, as did also Lord Cairns, from the opposition benches. The Municipal Franchise bill became law in August, 1869. One well-known statesman said at the time, "This is a revolution; this vote means still another, and there never was so great a revolution so speedily accomplished." In 1869 the Ballot act had not been passed; this was in the days of open voting. It was therefore possible to ascertain with accuracy in how large a proportion the women householders availed themselves of their restored right to vote whenever a contested election took place. On the following November a letter of inquiry was sent to the town clerk of every municipal borough in England and Wales, and by their courtesy in replying it was ascertained that the women voted in very large numbers. In our municipal towns the average ratio of women householders to men householders is about one to seven. This varies greatly in different localities. In Tewkesbury, for instance, there was only one woman householder to twenty-three men householders, while in Bath the proportion had risen as high as one to three. The women voters were in about the same proportion. In the larger boroughs the proportion was especially good, while there were cases in which the polling of the women exceeded that of the men. In Bodmin, Cornwall, two women voted, one of whom was 92 and the other 94 years of age.

The first public meeting in connection with women's suffrage was held in Manchester, April 14, 1868, in the assembly room of the Free Trade Hall. The occasion was one of great interest. Mr. Henry D. Pochin, the mayor of Salford (which adjoins Manchester), took the chair, and the first resolution was moved by

Digitized by Google

Miss Becker, seconded by the venerable Arch-deacon Sandford, and supported by Mr. T. B. Potter, M. P.:

Resolved, That the exclusion of women from the exercise of the franchise in the election of members, being unjust in principle and inexpedient in practice, this meeting is of opinion that the right of voting should be granted to them on the same conditions as it is or may be granted to men.

The other resolutions were spoken to by Dr. Pankhurst, Mrs. Pochin (who had also written a very exhaustive pamphlet on "The Claim of Woman to the Elective Franchise," signed, *Justitia*), Mr. Chisholm Anstey, Mr. Jacob Bright, M. P., Miss Annie Robertson of Dublin, Mr. F. W. Myers, fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Mr. J. W. Edwards. This meeting, and the one which followed in Birmingham, May 6, are fair types of those which have followed by thousands. With few exceptions they have been addressed by men and women jointly; the resolutions passed have generally been of a directly practical and political character. They have been presided over, whenever possible, by the chief magistrate, or some other well-known man in the locality; in comparatively few cases have women presided, and very seldom, indeed, strangers. Thus they have been modeled closely on the ordinary English political meeting; and this form, quite apart from the principles discussed at the meetings, has done much to identify women's suffrage with the practical politics of the day. The first meeting ever held in London (July, 1869,) excited much attention. Admittance here was by ticket. Mrs. Peter A. Taylor took the chair; Miss Biggs read the report, and a noble array of speakers followed.*

The principle of women's suffrage was unhesitatingly conceded by the passing of the Municipal Amendment act of 1869. The time was come to demand its application in parliamentary elections. Moreover, the decision of the Court of Common Pleas had left no mode of action possible except for parliament to reverse that decision. Mr. Jacob Bright, therefore, on the first day of the session gave notice of his intention to introduce a bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women. Sir Charles Dilke, a Liberal, and Mr. E. B. Eastwick, a Conservative, also gave their names on the back of the bill.

* Mr. Thomas Hare, Mr. Boyd Kinnear, Mr. Mill, who was no longer in parliament, the Rev. Charles Kingsley (this was the first and only meeting at which he was present), Prof. Fawcett, M. P. and Mrs. Fawcett, Lord Houghton, Mr. John Morley, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bt. M. P., Mr. P. A. Taylor, M. P., Professor Masson of Edinburgh, and Mr. Stamfeld, M. P.

Digitized by Google

A BILL *to remove the Electoral Disabilities of Women:*

Be it enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords, spiritual and temporal, and Commons in this present parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

First—That in all acts relating to the qualification and registration of voters or persons entitled or claiming to be registered and to vote in the election of members of parliament, wherever words occur which import the masculine gender, the same shall be held to include females for all purposes connected with, and having reference to the right to be registered as voters, and to vote in such elections, any law or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.

On February 16, the bill was read for the first time, and on May 4, it came on for its second reading. Mr. Jacob Bright earnestly appealed to the House to grant this measure of justice:

The women who are interested in this subject, he concluded, are only acting in the spirit of one of the noblest proverbs of our language, "God helps those who help themselves." Is it a matter of regret to us that they should have these aspirations? Ought it not rather to be a subject of satisfaction and of pride? That this bill will become law, no one who has observed the character of this agitation and who knows the love of justice in the British people can doubt. I hope it will become law soon, for I have a desire which will receive the sympathy of many in this House. I have a strong desire that when our children come to read the story of their country's fame, it may be written there that the British parliament was the first great legislative assembly in the world, which, in conferring its franchises, knew nothing of the distinctions of strong an weak, of male and female, of rich and poor.

The result of the division surprised and cheered all the supporters of the measure. The government was neutral, and members of the cabinet voted on either side according to their own opinions. The second reading was carried by a vote of 124 to 91, being a majority in its favor of 33. Those who witnessed that division will never forget the grateful enthusiasm with which Mr. Jacob Bright was received when he came up to the ladies' gallery, with his wife leaning upon his arm. But our triumph was short-lived. Before the bill went into committee, a week later, it became known that the government intended to depart from its attitude of neutrality. A strong pressure was exercised to crush the bill, and the contest of course became hopeless. On the division for going into committee 220 votes were counted against 94 in its favor.

It became evident that we were in for a long contest, which would require not only patience, courage and determination, but a high degree of political sagacity. Organizations had to be perfected, and additional societies established; meetings had to be called, and lectures given to explain the question. In March

Digitized by Google

of this year the *Women's Suffrage Journal* was established in Manchester. Miss Becker has conducted this monthly from the beginning with great talent and spirit; it is frequently quoted by the ordinary press, and its pages contain the best record extant of the movement. This same year of 1870, which witnessed our first parliamentary defeat, brought compensation also of such magnitude as to outweigh the temporary overthrow of the franchise bill. This was the Elementary Education act, by which women were not only admitted to vote for school-board candidates, but expressly enabled to sit on these boards, and thus exercise not only elective, but legislative functions of the most important character. The election clause reads thus:

The school-board shall be elected in the manner provided by this act, in a borough by the persons whose names are on the burgess roll of such borough for the time being in force, and in a parish not situated in the metropolis, by the rate-payers.

In London, with the sole exception of the city, the persons who elect the vestries, *i. e.* the rate-payers, are the electors—this includes women as a matter of course. In the city only, the electors were to be the same persons who elected common-council-men, and as these included men only, women are thus excluded from voting in the school-board election, though even here it may be observed they are eligible to sit on the board. Thus, within the space of two years, two important measures were extended unexpectedly.

In 1871 Mr. Jacob Bright again introduced the Women's Disabilities Removal bill, and it was also supported by Mr. Eastwick and Dr. Lyon Playfair. It was thrown out in the division upon the second reading on May 3, by a majority of 69; 151 (including tellers and pairs 159) voting for it, and 220 (including tellers and pairs 228) voting against it. The most remarkable feature of the debate was a speech made by Mr. Gladstone, which certainly justified the confidence that women have subsequently entertained that the great minister was willing to see justice done to them:

The ancient law recognized the rights of women in the parish; I apprehend they could both vote and act in the parish. The modern rule has extended the right to the municipality, so far as the right of voting is concerned. . . . With respect to school-boards, I own I believe that we have done wisely, on the whole, in giving both the franchise and the right of sitting on the school-board to women. Then comes a question with regard to parliament, and we have to ask ourselves whether we shall or shall not go further. . . . I admit, at any rate, that as far as I am able to judge, there is more presumptive ground for change in the law than some

Digitized by Google

of the opponents of the measure are disposed to own. . . . I cannot help thinking that, for some reason or other, there are various important particulars in which women obtain much less than justice under social arrangements. . . . I may be told that there is no direct connection between this and the parliamentary franchise, and I admit it, but at the same time I am by no means sure that these inequalities may not have an indirect connection with a state of law in which the balance is generally cast too much against women, and too much in favor of men. There is one instance which has been quoted, and I am not sure there is not something in it—I mean the case of farms. . . . I believe to some extent in the competition for that particular employment women suffer in a very definite manner in consequence of their want of qualification to vote. I go somewhat further than this, and say that so far as I am able to form an opinion of the general tone and color of our law in these matters, where the peculiar relation of men and women is concerned, that law does less than justice to women [hear, hear], and great mischief, misery and scandal result from that state of things in many of the occurrences and events of life. [Cheers.] . . . If it should be found possible to arrange a safe and well-adjusted alteration of the law as to political power, the man who shall attain that object, and who shall see his purpose carried onward to its consequences in a more just arrangement of the provisions of other laws bearing upon the condition and welfare of women, will, in my opinion, be a real benefactor to his country. [Cheers.]

In another portion of his speech Mr. Gladstone said that the personal attendance of women in election proceedings, until the principle of secret voting should be adopted, was in his eyes an objection of the greatest force—thus giving reason to believe that as soon as vote by ballot was secured, this objection would be removed. Mr. Gladstone did not on this occasion vote against the bill, but left the House without voting.

In 1872, our indefatigable leader again moved the second reading of the bill on the 4th of May. His speech was calm and masterly, and he was ably supported, but the division remained much the same; 143 for the bill and 222 against it. This year the Scotch Education bill was passed, which extended the voting of women and their election on school-boards to Scotland; thus the principle of direct representation on a matter so important as national education was recognized. The Ballot act also, which at once rendered elections orderly and safe, henceforth gave increased security and comfort to women who were voting in municipal elections.

In this year a new committee was established in London called the Central committee, to which all other branches of the society

Digitized by Google

had the right of appointing delegates, and the movement received thereby a considerable increase of strength and solidity.*

Meantime each branch of the society was working away indefatigably. During 1871, the *Suffrage Journal* recorded 135 public meetings, and during 1872, 104 in England and 63 in Scotland. The work in Scotland was chiefly carried on in the way of lectures by Miss Jane Taylour, who during these early years of the movement was an untiring and spirited pioneer, Miss Agnes McLaren often accompanying her and helping her to organize the meetings.

We must not omit to mention Mary Burton (sister of John Hill Burton the historiographer of Scotland), who was also one of the most energetic workers of the Edinburgh committee, especially in the north of Scotland; and Mrs. Dick Lauder who had the courage to free herself from the opinions in which she had been educated, and with much sacrifice devoted herself to the work. Space fails us fitly to record the indomitable efforts of Eliza Wigham, one of the honorable secretaries of the Edinburgh committee. In England, Mrs. Ronniger organized and spoke at many meetings, as did Mrs. Fawcett, Miss Rhoda Garrett, Miss Becker, Miss Craigen and, less frequently, Mrs. Josephine Butler, Lady Amberley, Miss Annie Young and others. Mrs. Grote, wife of the historian and herself a well-known author, took part in one meeting held in Hanover Square rooms, London, on March 26, 1870. Mrs. Grote was then upwards of seventy years of age. Rising with great majesty, she spoke with all the weight that age, ability and experience could give, greatly impressing her audience. Miss Helen Taylor, step-daughter of John Stuart Mill, also made her maiden speech at this meeting; it was delivered with much grace, excellent in thought as in manner.

Many additional local committees were established, and good work was done by familiarizing the public mind with the principles of the association. Ward meetings were held in which the women burgesses and municipal voters were assembled, and while the responsibilities of the vote they already possessed were pointed out to them, attention was called to the prior importance of the vote which was withheld from them.

* Mrs. Penington, Mr. Hopwood, Q. C. and Professor Amos were honorary secretaries the first year, and succeeding them Miss C. A. Biggs and Miss Agnes Garrett. The principal committees united with the central, including Bristol, Birmingham, Manchester, Edinburgh, Dublin and the North of Ireland.

Digitized by Google

In 1873, for the fourth time, our unwearied champion, Mr. Jacob Bright, brought forward his bill. This time the second reading was fixed for April 30. He was supported in the debate by Mr. Eastwick, Sergeant Sherlock, Lord John Manners, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Heron, Mr. Henley, and Sir J. Trelawny. While all these gentlemen deserved our thanks for the able assistance they rendered the cause, the speech of Mr. Henley, Conservative member for Oxfordshire, so old a member that he was styled the "Father of the House," excited special attention. He said he had once felt considerable doubt and dislike of the measure, but after careful watching of the way in which women gave the local votes, he had come to the conclusion that an extension of the principle would be useful. The votes in favor of the bill increased at this debate to 155 (with tellers and pairs 172), a larger number than had ever before been obtained, while the opposition remained stationary.

Along with the petitions of this year were two memorials signed by upwards of 11,000 women, and presented to Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli. Every English county, with the exception of the smallest, Rutland, and most large towns sent representative signatures. An effort was made this session by Mr. William Johnston, the member for Belfast, to introduce amendments into the Irish Municipal bill, which would have had the effect of extending the municipal franchise to Irish women householders. But the bill was withdrawn, and similar efforts made in subsequent years have met with the like fate.

This year the death of Mr. John Stuart Mill saddened the hearts of all. He will never be forgotten as the first man who carried this question into the arena of practical politics and gave it the weight of an honored name. The strength and vitality of the movement were further tested by a disaster which threatened to do it a lasting injury. The general election took place early in the spring of 1874, and to the regret and consternation of the friends of equal suffrage, their able and devoted leader, Mr. Jacob Bright, lost his seat for Manchester—a loss in a great degree attributable to his unshrinking advocacy of an unpopular question. Never did his clients, for whom he had sacrificed so much, feel so deeply the need of the power which the franchise would have given them to keep so good a friend in the House of Commons. Not only was Mr. Bright defeated, but Mr. Eastwick, the friend who had always seconded the bill, also lost his seat with about

Digitized by Google

seventy others of our supporters. We were thus compelled to look around for fresh leaders. The task of bringing in a bill was accepted by Mr. Forsyth, the Conservative member for Marylebone, one of the London boroughs; with him were associated Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Russell Gurney and Sir R. Anstruther, men differing widely on matters of party politics. The bill was introduced early in the session, but no day was found for it, and in the middle of July it was withdrawn. Considerable discussion was excited by the unexpected action of Mr. Forsyth, who on his own responsibility inserted in the bill an additional clause by which married women were especially excluded from its operation. Although the insertion of this clause would probably have made no difference, the bulk of legal opinion being that under the law of coverture, married women even when possessed of property are not "qualified persons," yet the society joined in requesting that this additional clause should be dropped and the original form of the bill adhered to.

Memorials signed by upwards of 18,000 women headed by Florence Nightingale, Harriet Martineau, Lady Anna Gore Langton (sister of the Duke of Buckingham), Frances Power Cobbe, Anna Swanwick, were again this year forwarded to Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone. An important memorial was also forwarded from a large conference held in Birmingham in January, which represents very accurately the special aspects of the question in England. The president of the conference was Mrs. William Taylor, sister-in-law of Mr. Peter A. Taylor, M. P.:

To the Right Honorable William Ewart Gladstone, M. P., First Lord of Her Majesty's Treasury:

The memorial of members and friends of the National Society for Women's Suffrage, in conference assembled at Birmingham, January 22, 1874, showeth, that your memorialists earnestly desire to urge on the attention of her majesty's government the justice and expediency of abolishing the disability which precludes women, otherwise legally qualified, from voting in the election of members of parliament.

They submit that the disability is anomalous, inasmuch as it exists only in respect to the parliamentary franchise. The electoral rights of women have been from time immemorial equal and similar to those of men in parochial and other ancient franchises, and in the year 1869 a measure was passed, with the sanction of the administration of which you are the head, restoring and confirming the rights of women ratepayers to the exercise of the municipal franchise.

The electoral disability is further anomalous, because by the law and constitution of this realm, women are not disabled from the exercise of

Digitized by Google

political power. Writs, returning members to serve in the House of Commons, signed by women as electors or returning officers, are now in existence, and the validity of such returns has never been disputed. Women who were heirs to peerages and other dignities exercised judicial jurisdiction and enjoyed other privileges appertaining to such offices and lordships without disability of sex. The highest political function known to the constitution may be exercised by a woman. The principle that women may have political power is coëval with the British constitution. On the other hand the practice of women taking part in voting at popular elections is equally ancient in date, and has been restored and extended by the action of the present parliament. Your memorialists therefore submit that to bring the existing principle and practice into harmony by removing the disability which prevents women who vote in local elections from voting in the election of members of parliament, would be a step in the natural process of development by which institutions, while retaining the strength and authority derived from the traditions of the past, and preserving the continuity of the national life, continually undergo such modifications as are needed in order to adapt them to the exigencies of the age and the changed conditions of modern life.

They also submit that the old laws regulating the qualifications of electors do not limit the franchise to male persons; that the laws under which women exercised the parochial franchise were couched in the same general terms as those regulating the parliamentary suffrage, and that while the latter were not expressly limited to men, the former were not expressly extended to women. There is, therefore, a strong presumption that the exclusion of women from the parliamentary suffrage was an infringement on their ancient constitutional rights, rendered possible in a barbarous age by the comparative weakness and smallness of the number of persons affected by it, and continued until the exclusion had become customary. The franchise of women in local elections has been from time to time under judicial consideration, and their right to take part in such elections has been repeatedly confirmed by the judges. During the arguments in these cases, the question of their right to vote in the election of members of parliament was frequently mooted and conflicting opinions thereon incidently expressed by various judges, but the matter was never judicially decided, and no authoritative judgment was ever given against the right until the year 1868, after the passing of two modern acts of parliament in 1832 and 1867, the former of which for the first time in English history, in terms, limited the franchise created by it to every "male person," and the latter to every "man" qualified under its provisions. Your memorialists submit that had the question of the right of women to vote in the election of members of parliament been raised in the law courts under the old statutes which contain no reference to sex, and before the passing of the limiting acts of 1832 and 1867, that the precedents which had determined the right in their favor in the construction of the law as to local government must have been held to apply to the case of qualified freeholders or others who claimed the right as regards parliamentary government.

Digitized by Google

They submit also, that even after these limiting acts, women had reasonable grounds for claiming the suffrage under the existing law. There is an act of parliament which declares that "in all acts, words importing the masculine gender shall be deemed and taken to include females, . . . unless the contrary is *expressly provided.*" The act of 1867 contained clauses imposing personal liabilities and pecuniary burdens on certain classes of ratepayers. In these clauses, as in the enfranchising clauses, and throughout the act, words importing the masculine gender were alone used. No provision was made that these words should not include females. Accordingly in enforcing the act the extra liabilities and burdens were imposed on women ratepayers, to many of whom they caused grievous hardship. There was, therefore, reason to expect that the enfranchising clauses would bear the same interpretation, inasmuch as they were confessedly offered as an equivalent for the increased liabilities. But when the women who had been subjected to the liabilities claimed their votes, they found that words importing the masculine gender were held to include women in the clauses imposing burdens, and to exclude them in the clauses conferring privileges, in one and the same act of parliament.

This kind of injustice was shown in a marked manner in the case of certain women ratepayers of Bridgewater, who, in a memorial addressed to you in 1871, set forth the grievance of most heavy and unjust taxation which was levied on them, in common with the other householders of that disfranchised borough, for the payment of a prolonged commission respecting political bribery. The memorialists felt it to be unjust and oppressive, inasmuch as, not exercising the franchise nor being in any way directly or indirectly concerned in the malpractices which led to the commision, they were nevertheless required to pay not less than three shillings in the pound according to their rental. To that memorial you caused a reply to be sent through Mr. Secretary Bruce, stating that "it was not in the power of the secretary of State to exempt women owning or occupying property from the local and imperial taxation to which that property is liable." While fully admitting this, your memorialists beg to represent that it is in the power of the legislature to secure to women the vote which their property would confer, along with its liability to local and imperial taxation, were it owned or occupied by men.

They submit that this concession has recently been granted in respect to local taxation, and that if justice demands that women should have a voice in controlling the municipal expenditure to which their property contributes, justice yet more urgently demands that they should have a voice in controlling the imperial expenditure to which the same property is liable. The local expenditure of the country amounts to about £30,000,000, the imperial expenditure to about £70,000,000 annually; if, therefore, the matter be regarded as one of taxation only, the latter vote is of more importance than the former. Local government deals with men and women alike, and knows no distinction between male and female ratepayers. But imperial government deals with men and women on different principles, and in such a manner that whenever there is any distinction made in the rights, privileges and protection accorded to them

Digitized by Google

respectively, the difference is always against women and in favor of men. They believe this state of things is a natural result of the exclusion of women from representation, and it will be found impracticable to amend it until women are admitted to a share in controlling the legislature.

By the deprivation of the parliamentary vote, women, in the purchase or renting of property, obtain less for their money than men. In a bill which passed the House of Commons last session, provision was made for the amalgamation in one list of the municipal and parliamentary registers of electors. In that list it appeared that the same house, the same rent and the same taxes conferred on a man the double vote in municipal and parliamentary government, and on a woman the single vote only, and that the less honorable and important one. When the occupation of a house is transferred from a man to a woman, say to the widow of the former owner, that home loses the privilege of representation in the imperial government, though its relations with the taxgatherer continue unaltered. There have been various societies formed with a view to enable persons to acquire portions of landed or real property, partly for the sake of the vote attached to such property. Should a woman purchase or inherit such an estate, the vote, which has been one important consideration in determining the value, would be lost through her legal disability to exercise it.

The deprivation of the vote is a serious disadvantage to women in the competition for farms. A case is recorded of one estate in Suffolk from which seven widows have been ejected, who, if they had possesed votes, would have been continued as tenants. A sudden ejection often means ruin to a family that has sunk capital in the land, and it is only too probable that no day passes without the occurence of some such calamity to some unhappy widow, who, but for the electoral disability, might have retained the home and the occupation by which she could have brought up her family in comfort and independence.

Besides this definite manner in which the electoral disability injures women farmers, it has a more or less directly injurious influence on all self-dependent women who maintain themselves and their families by other than domestic labor. A disability, the basis of which is the presumed mental or moral incapacity of the subject of it to form a rational judgment on matters within the ordinary ken of human intelligence, carries with it a stigma of inferiority calculated to cause impediment to the entrance on or successful prosecution of any pursuit demanding recognized ability and energy. This presumed incapacity is probably the origin of the general neglect of the education of women, which is only now beginning to be acknowledged, and the absence of political power in the neglected class renders it difficult if not impossible to obtain an adequate share for girls in the application of educational funds and endowments. So long as women are specifically excluded from control over their parliamentary representatives, so long will their interests be postponed to claims of those who have votes to give; and while parliament shall continue to declare that the voices of women are unfit to be taken into account in choosing members of the legislature, the masses of men

Digitized by Google

will continue to act as if their wishes, opinions and interests were undeserving of serious consideration.

It is now nearly two years since you, in your place in the House of Commons, said that the number of absolutely self-dependent women is increasing from year to year, and that the progressive increase in the number of such women is a very serious fact, because those women are assuming the burdens that belong to men; and you stated your belief that when they are called upon to assume those burdens, and to undertake the responsibility of providing for their own subsistence, they approach the task under greater difficulties than attach to their more powerful competitors. Your memorialists therefore ask you to aid women in overcoming these difficulties, by assisting to place them, politically at least, on a level with those whom you designate as "their more powerful competitors."

One of the greatest hindrances in the path of self-dependent women is the opposition shown by members of many trades and professions to women who attempt to engage in them. The medical and academical authorities of the University of Edinburgh have successfully crushed the attempt of a small band of female students to qualify themselves for the medical profession, and the same spirit of "trades unionism" is rife in the industrial community. A few months ago the printers of Manchester, learning that a few girls were practicing type-setting, and endeavoring to earn a little money thereby, instantly passed a rule ordaining a strike in the shop of any master printer who should allow type set up by women to be sent to his machines to be worked. At the present time, in a manufacturing district in Yorkshire where there are "broad" and "narrow" looms, at the former of which much more money can be earned, the men refuse to allow women to work at the broad looms, though they are quite able to manage them, because the work is considered too remunerative for women. At Nottingham there is a particular machine at which very high wages can be earned, at which women now work, and the men, in order to drive them out of such profitable employment, have insisted on the masters taking no more women on, but as those at present employed leave, supplying their places by men. A master manufacturer reports: "We have machines which women can manage quite as well or better than men, yet are they not permitted by a selfish combination of the strong against the weak." These are only samples of the cases that are constantly occurring of successful attempts to drive women out of remunerative occupations. Your memorialists submit that women would be more able to resist such attempts if they had the protection of the suffrage; and that men would be less likely to be thus aggressive and oppressive if they had learned to regard women as their political equals.

Besides the restrictions on the industrial liberties of women effected by combinations of men, there are existing and proposed legislative restrictions from which men are exempt, and which exercise a powerful influence on the market for their labor. For the coming session we have the proposal further to limit their hours of paid labor in factories, and to place other restrictions on their labor in shops; also a proposition to place

Digitized by Google

married women on the footing of half-timers. Without here expressing any opinion as to the wisdom of these proposals, we urge that members of the House of Commons would be more capable of dealing with them in a just and appreciative spirit if they were responsible for their votes to the persons whose interests are directly concerned and whose liberties they are asked to curtail; and, further, that it is a grave question how far it is safe to trust the industrial interests of women, as a class, to the irresponsible control of the men who have manifested to individuals and to sections of working women the spirit indicated by the examples we have cited.

In the same speech you spoke of a state of the law in which the balance is generally cast too much against women and too much in favor of men. Since you directed your attention to this matter, you have not been able either to introduce or to assist others who have introduced measures to ameliorate the state of the law respecting women, and such proposals have been unable to win consideration from parliament. Your memorialists cannot believe that this neglect has arisen from want of a desire on your part to deal with the grievances under which you have admitted that your countrywomen suffer; they are therefore led to the conclusion that you have been unable to take into consideration the affairs of an unrepresented class, owing to the preoccupation of parliament with the concerns of those to whom it is directly responsible.

You stated that "the question was, to devise a method of enabling women to exercise a sensible influence, without undertaking personal functions and exposing themselves to personal obligations inconsistent with the fundamental particulars of their condition as women," and that the objection to the personal attendance of women at elections was in your mind an objection of the greatest force. They respectfully submit that the exercise of the municipal franchise involves the personal attendance of women at the polls, and that since your words were uttered changes have been effected which render the process of voting absolutely identical for municipal and parliamentary elections, and the whole proceeding perfectly decorous and orderly. Experience has proved that women can vote at municipal elections without prejudice to the fundamental particulars of their condition as women, whatever these may be; and this experience shows that they may vote in parliamentary elections without the smallest personal prejudice or inconvenience. The school-board elections have also shown that women can appeal to large constituencies and go through the ordeal of public meetings, addresses and questions from electors, to which men must submit who seek the suffrages of a great community, without any sacrifice of womanly dignity, or of the respect and consideration accorded to their position and their sex. They therefore submit that events have obviated the objections you entertained in 1871 to the proposal to give representation to women, and that the course taken by the administration over which you preside in assenting to the extension of the municipal and school-board franchise to them; in calling them to the public functions of candidates and members of school-boards; and lastly, of securing the passing of a law which renders the process of

Digitized by Google

voting silent and secret, have taken away all reasonable grounds for objecting on the score of practical inconvenience to the admission of women to the exercise of a vote, which they would have to give in precisely the same manner, but not nearly so often, as those votes which they already deliver.

It has been said that there is neither desire nor demand for the measure, and further, that women do not care for and would not use the suffrage if they possessed it. But the demand for the parliamentary franchise is enormously greater than was the demand for the municipal franchise, and for the school-board franchise there was no apparent call. Yet these two measures were passed purely on their own merits, and it was not held to be necessary to impose on their promoters, over and above the obligation to make out their case, the condition that a majority of the women of England or of a particular district should petition for the proposed boon. Experience proved the wisdom and justice of this course, for although women throughout the country had taken no active part in agitating for the municipal franchise, no sooner was the privilege accorded than they freely availed themselves of it, and statistics obtained from some of the largest boroughs in the kingdom show that from the first year that women possessed the suffrage, they have voted in about equal proportion with men to the number of each on the register. The parliamentary vote is more honorable and important than the municipal vote; it is, therefore, safe to conclude that women who value and use the latter will appreciate and exercise the former as soon as it shall be bestowed upon them. Your memorialists submit that great injustice and injury are done by debarring these women from a voting power which there is such strong presumptive ground for believing that they would freely exercise but for the legal restraint.

Your memorialists are especially moved to call your attention to the urgency of the claim at the present time, when a bill extending the application of the principle of household suffrage is about to be proposed to parliament, which bill received last year such expressions of approval from members of her majesty's government as to lead to the belief that they are willing to take the proposal into serious consideration. They submit that the claim and the need for representation of women householders are even more pressing than that of agricultural laborers. The grievances under which women suffer are equally great, and the demand for the franchise has been pressed by a much greater number of women and for a much longer period of time than in the case of county householders now excluded. The number of persons who petitioned last session for the County Franchise bill and for the Women's Disabilities bill respectively were, for the former, 1,889, and for the latter, 329,206. The latter bill has received most influential support from both sides of the House, and more votes have been recorded in its favor than have been given for any bill not directly supported as a party measure by one or other of the great parties in the State. Under these circumstances your memorialists earnestly request that you will use your influence as leader of the House of Commons and of the government to secure the

Digitized by Google

passing of the bill introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright, either as a substantive enactment, or as an integral portion of the next measure that shall be passed dealing with the question of the representation of the people.

Signed on behalf of the conference,

CAROLINE M. TAYLOR, *President.*

The first vote that was given by the new parliament was on April 7, 1875, Mr. Forsyth having moved the second reading in an able speech. It at once became manifest that the question had made great progress in the country. In spite of the loss of the seventy friends at the preceding general election, our strength in the new parliament had greatly increased. Including tellers and pairs, 170 voted for the bill, and only 250 against. This result appears to have alarmed our opponents, who proceeded to form an association of peers, members of parliament and other influential persons, to resist the claims of women to the suffrage. They issued a circular which will be read by future generations with a smile of amazement.*

It may have been partly owing to the influence of this association that the next year, when Mr. Forsyth again brought forward his bill, April 26, 1876, although the numbers of our friends and supporters remained undiminished, the opponents had considerably increased. This was due, also, no doubt, in great degree to the unexpected attitude taken on this question by the Right Hon. John Bright, the most powerful living advocate for freedom and representative government. In Mr. Mill's division of 1867, Mr. Bright had voted in favor of the measure, and while his brother had charge of the bill, he had never opposed it. His opposition speech in this debate, therefore, caused extreme disappointment and discouragement. It had little of the force which had always characterized his pleas for political justice. The most eloquent voice in the House of Commons lost its magic power when no longer inspired by truth. The women in the gallery listened with sorrowful hearts. Though they knew

* Minutes of a meeting at the House of Commons, June 23, 1875. Present: The Right Honorable E. P. Bouverie, in the chair; and the following members of parliament: Right Hon. H. C. Childers, Marquis of Hamilton, Lord Randolph Churchill, Hon. E. Stanhope, Mr. Bentinck, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Hayter, Sir Henry Holland, Sir Henry James, Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, Mr. Edward Leatham, Mr. Merewether, Mr. Newdegate, Mr. Raikes, Mr. de Rothschild, Mr. Scousfield, Mr. Whitbread.

Resolved, That a committee of peers, members of parliament and other influential men be organized for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the franchise, in opposition to the claims for the extension of the parliamentary suffrage to women.

Resolved, That Mr. E. P. Bouverie be requested to act as chairman, and Lord Claud John Hamilton and Mr. Kay Shuttleworth as honorary secretaries.

The following members have since joined those named above: Lord Elcho, Right Hon. E. Knatchbull-Hugessen, Right Hon. J. R. Mowbray, Sir Thomas Bazley, Mr. Butt, Mr. Gibson and Colonel Kingscote.

Digitized by Google

Mr. Bright's opinion could not block the wheels of progress, yet they felt intense regret that so honored a friend to freedom should abandon his most cherished principles when applied to women.

The parliamentary history of the next few years may be very briefly recorded. In 1877 the bill had again passed into the hands of our beloved leader, Mr. Jacob Bright, who had resumed his place in the House of Commons, as member of parliament for Manchester. After a debate of great interest, and while our advocate, Mr. Leonard Courtney, was speaking, the opponents of the measure burst into a tumultuous uproar, which effectually drowned his voice. This new method of setting up shouts and howls in place of arguments, has since been brought to bear on more than one public question, but it was then comparatively novel. Mr. Courtney, nothing daunted, would not give way, and when six o'clock, which is the hour for closing the debates on Wednesday, struck, it was no longer possible to take a division.

The following year, 1878, Mr. Jacob Bright was unable from failing health to continue in charge of the bill in the House of Commons, and a deputation of members from each society waited on Mr. Courtney and placed it in his hands. June 19, was set for the second reading. In his speech Mr. Courtney dwelt on the benefits that may accrue to women from representation. He added:

> The political reasons for granting the prayer of the bill appear to me to be undeniable, but I confess they are not the reasons why I most strongly support it. I believe it will develop a fuller, freer and nobler character in women by admitting them into the sphere of political thought and duty. Some may say, "But what is to be the end?" I do not know that we are always bound to see the goal towards which we are moving. If we are moving on right principles; if we are actuated by a feeling of justice; if the hand that moves above us and leads us on is a hand in which we can place implicit confidence,—then I say, trust to that light, follow that hand, without fear of the future.

The bill was again lost by 219 votes against 140, thus showing a smaller adverse majority than on the last division. This year Mr. Russell Gurney died. His name will always be associated with the women's suffrage movement, which he had supported ever since Mr. Mill's division in 1867. The death of Lady Anna Gore Langton about this time was also a severe loss.

The last time that the question was brought before that parliament was the following summer, 1870. Mr. Courtney, after

Digitized by Google

taking counsel with his parliamentary friends, made an important change in the conduct of his measure. It had hitherto been brought forward as a bill, which, if passed, would have made the actual change desired in the law; as the parliament was now verging towards its close, it was thought wiser to test the opinion of the House by bringing the question forward in the form of a resolution. Two purposes were served by this change: one was that many men who were in favor of the principle of women's suffrage had objected to it when brought forward as an isolated measure of reform involving a large addition to the constituency, and possibly therefore a new election; the other was, that the time for discussion of a private member's bill is very limited. On Wednesdays, when such bills come on, the House only sits in the morning, and the debate must be concluded at a quarter before six, while the forms of the House afford greater facilities for discussing and voting upon motions. Mr. Courtney in a clear and exhaustive speech moved his resolution as follows:

That in the opinion of this House it is injurious to the best interests of the country that women who are entitled to vote in municipal, parochial and school-board elections when possessed of the statutory qualifications, should be disabled from voting in parliamentary elections, although possessed of the statutory qualifications, and that it is expedient that this disability should be forthwith repealed.

The debate was animated, but the result on division was much the same as before: 113 (including tellers and pairs, 144) voting for it, and 217 (with tellers and pairs, 248) against it. Thus closed the ninth parliament of Victoria, as far as women's suffrage was concerned.

The steady perseverance and unflagging courage of the devoted band of men and women had achieved victories at many points along the line of attack.* Every suffrage meet-

* We must mention the names of the ladies who during the previous two or three years had been most active in speaking and organizing societies. So many meetings had been held that there was hardly a town of any importance in England, Ireland or Scotland where the principles of woman suffrage had not been explained and canvassed. One of the foremost for her activity in this department of work was Miss Mary Beedy, an American lady, resident for some years in England. She had thoroughly mastered the legal and political condition of the question in this country, and her untiring energy, her clear common sense, and her ready logic made her advocacy invaluable. The regret was general when she was compelled to return to America. Miss Helena Downing, niece of Mr. McCarthy Downing, member of parliament for Cork, arranged and gave many lectures during 1873 and 1874. Miss. Lillias Ashworth, honorary secretary of the Bristol committee, frequently spoke at meetings about this time. In Scotland Miss Jane Taylour and others still continued their indefatigable labors, in which they were frequently assisted by Miss Isabella Stuart of Balgonie in Fifeshire. In Ireland, in addition to the usual meetings in the north, a series of meetings in the south was undertaken by Miss Tod, Miss Beedy and Miss Downing. Other meetings were addressed by Miss Fawcett, Miss Becker, Miss Caroline Biggs, Miss Eliza Sturge, Miss Rhoda Garrett, Mrs. Fenwick-Miller and many others. During 1873 Mrs. Henry Kingsley, sister-in-law of one novelist and wife of another, also

Digitized by Google

Priscilla McLaren

Digitized by Google

ing was the means of gaining converts. The agitation for the suffrage kept the memory of women's wrongs and grievances fresh before the public mind. These years saw the medical profession legally thrown open to women, and facilities given them in school and hospital for obtaining that education which had been hitherto sought abroad. Pharmacy no longer excluded them. London University opened its gates. The Irish Intermediate Education bill, in 1878, which was originally introduced for boys only, was, after several energetic discussions, widened, so as to include girls. Women began to be elected as poor-law guardians. A Scotch Married Women's Property bill was passed, which was a great improvement on the former law. A Matrimonial Causes Amendment act was also carried, which enables magistrates to grant a judicial separation to wives who are brutally treated, along with a maintenance for their children. Some of our friends regretted that these side issues should absorb the time of those who might otherwise have been working exclusively for suffrage; but this was a short-sighted fear. By broadening the basis of work, by asking simultaneously for better laws, better education, better employments and wider fields of usefulness, the sympathies of more women were engaged; while underlying and supporting all was the steady agitation for the suffrage with its compact organization of committees, meetings, publications and petitions which kept parliament awake to the fact that though still disfranchised, women had claims which it could not afford to ignore.

This was a time when the agitation for the suffrage had apparently reached a stationary condition, neither advancing nor receding, in which it was destined to remain for some years longer. Other causes, as the abolition of West Indian slavery and the corn laws, have had a similar period of apparent torpor succeeding the first activity. Justin McCarthy in his "History of our own Times," says:

---

spoke frequently. Space fails me to do justice to the varied powers of the speakers who have carried our movement on during these years of patient perseverance; to the clear logic and convincing power of Mrs. Fawcett's speeches; to the thrillling eloquence of her cousin, Rhoda Garrett, now, alas! no longer with us; to Miss Becker's accurate legal knowledge and masterly presentation of facts and arguments; to Miss Helena Downing's eloquence marked by the humor, pathos and power which were hers by national inheritance. During these years of trial, too, the cause owed much to the strenuous advocacy of the Misses Ashworth, Anne Frances and Lillias Sophia, nieces of Jacob Bright. Miss Ashworth did not herself speak at meetings, but she comforted and helped those who did, while Lillias possesed the family gift of eloquence and charmed her audience by her witty, forcible and telling speeches. So numerous and so well attended have been these meetings during these and subsequent years, that it is imposible to exonerate men and women from the charge of willful blindness if they still misconstrue the plain facts of the question.

Digitized by Google

Priscilla [illegible]

Digitized by Google

[illegible] gathering [illegible] The [illegible] mind. [illegible] open to [illegible] for [illegible] abroad. Pharm[illegible] [illegible]versity opened its [illegible] in 1878, which was [illegible] several [illegible] Women [illegible] Married Women's Property [illegible] improvement on the former [illegible] A [illegible] ment act was also carried [illegible] judicial separation [illegible] a maintenance for their [illegible] regretted that these side issues should [illegible] of those who might otherwise have been working [illegible] suffrage; but this was a short-sighted fear. By [illegible] of work, by asking simultaneously for better [illegible] education, better employments and wider fields of [illegible] sympathies of more women were engaged; while [illegible] supporting all was the steady agitation for the [illegible] compact organization of committees, meetings, [illegible] petitions which kept parliament awake to the [illegible] still disfranchised, women had claims which it could [illegible] ignore.

[illegible] is a time when the agitation for the [illegible] reached a stationary condition, neither advan[illegible] ceding, in which it was destined to remain for some [illegible] other causes, as the abolition of West Indian slavery [illegible] have had a similar period of apparent torp[illegible] ing the first activity. Justin McCarthy in his "Histo[illegible] own Times," says:

[illegible] Space [illegible] the varied powers of the [illegible] these years of [illegible] [illegible] Mrs. [illegible] During [illegible] the [illegible] Frances and [illegible] Sophia [illegible] herself spoke at meetings, but she [illegible] and helped [illegible] the [illegible] gift of eloquence and charmed [illegible] [illegible] and women [illegible] the charge of [illegible] still [illegible] the question.

Priscilla McLaren

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R L

Digitized by Google

This is, from whatever cause, a very common phenomenon in our political history. A movement which began with the promise of sweeping all before it, seems to lose all its force, and is supposed by many observers to be now only the care of a few earnest and fanatical men. Suddenly it is taken up by a minister of commanding influence, and the bore or the crotchet of one parliament is the great party controversy of a second, and the accomplished triumph of a third.

During the year of 1879, it was thought desirable to ascertain by some practical test what were the various reasons which caused thinking women to wish for the suffrage; and letters were addressed to ladies who were eminent either in literature or art, or who were following scientific or professional careers, or were engaged in any form of philanthropic work. The answers that were returned were collected into a pamphlet of exceeding interest, which was sent to each member before the debate, and it was amazing to watch from the gallery how the little green pamphlet was consulted and quoted from, in the most opposite quarters of the House, by friends who sought fresh arguments from it or by enemies who were looking for some sentence on which to base a sarcasm.*

As a specimen of these letters Miss Frances Power Cobbe said:

So far from the truth is the reiterated statement of certain honorable members of parliament that women do not desire the franchise, that in my large experience I have scarcely ever known a woman possessed of ordinary common sense, and who had lived some years alone in the world, who did not earnestly wish for it. The women who gratify these gentlemen by smilingly deprecating any such responsibilities, are those who have dwelt since they were born in well-feathered nests, and have never needed to do anything but open their soft beaks for the choicest little grubs to be dropped into them. It is utterly absurd (and I am afraid the members of parliament in question are quite aware they are talking nonsense) to argue from the contented squawks of a brood of these callow

* First in the list came six ladies, members of school-boards: Mrs. Buckton of Leeds, Miss Helena Richardson of Bristol, Mrs. Surr, Mrs. Westlake, Mrs. Fenwick Miller and Miss Helen Taylor, London; then followed the opinions of ladies who were guardians of the poor. Forty ladies known as authoresses or painters came next on the list; among these were Mrs. Allingham, Mrs. Cowden Clarke, Mrs. Eiloart, Mary Howitt, Emily Pfeiffer, Augusta Webster. Women doctors came next: Dr. Garrett Anderson, Dr. Annie Barker, Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, Dr. Sophia Jex-Blake, Dr. Eliza Dunbar, Dr. Frances Hoggan, Dr. Edith Pechey; and next to the doctors came Miss Eliza Orme, the only woman who was successfully practicing law. The section of education included the names of Mrs. Wm. Gray, and her sister, Miss Shirreff, Mrs. Nichol (Edinburgh), Miss Emily Davies, founder of Girton College, Miss Byers, founder of the Ladies' Collegiate School, Belfast, Mrs. Crawshay and Miss Mary Gurney. Nineteen ladies, the heads of women's colleges and high-schools, next gave their reasons why they desired the suffrage. After these came ladies engaged in philanthropic work, which included the sisters Rosamund and Florence Davenport Hill, Florence Nightingale, Miss Ellice Hopkins, eminent for rescue work; Miss Irby, well-known for her efforts among the starving Bosnian fugitives; Miss Manning, secretary of the National Indian Association; Mrs. Southey, secretary of the Women's Peace Association; Mrs. Lucas, and Mrs. Edward Parker, president and secretary of the British Women's Temperance Society. The opinions were various, both in kind and in length, some being only a confession of faith in a couple of lines, others a page of able reasoning.

Digitized by Google

creatures, that full grown swallows and larks have no need of wings, and are always happiest when their pinions are broken.

The production of this pamphlet marked an era in women's suffrage literature. It was impossible after this to doubt that a large body of thinking women, not the queens of society, but the women who wrote, read, thought, or worked, were in favor of having full admission to political rights and responsibilities.

The chief work of the society had now crystallized into five or six great centres. Edinburgh, under the presidency of Mrs. McLaren, assisted by Miss Wigham and Miss Kirkland, treasurer and secretary, was the recognized centre of activity for Scotland. In Ireland there was a committee in Dublin, of which Mrs. Haslam is the most active member; and the North of Ireland Committee, led by Miss Isabella Tod.* The three principal associations in England were those of London,† including the east and north-east counties; Manchester,‡ taking charge of the north of England and Wales, and Bristol § looking after the West. The officers of the several committees of the three kingdoms form a National Central Committee which has its headquarters in London and superintends all of the work bearing specially upon the action of parliament.

Petitions were still sent in, but no longer in such enormous numbers. It had become evident that parliament cared little for a long roll of names from the unrepresented classes; they were now chiefly collected as a means of discovering how public opinion stood in any particular district. For instance, in 1879, a petition was sent from 1,447 women householders of Leicester. The total number of women householders in this town was 2,610, of whom only 1,991 could be applied to, and there is no reason to suppose that public opinion was more advanced in Leicester than in the majority of large manufacturing towns.

* Miss Tod gives the spirit to each movement in Ulster, which is the intellectual headquarters of Ireland. She is the pioneer in all matters of reform; she is asked to speak in churches; she instigated the efforts which led to girls participating in the benefits of the Irish Intermediate Education act, which was being restricted to boys; she has organized and has won friends and votes not only over her own district of Ulster, but in many other quarters of Ireland; and often when in England some indefinable torpor has crept over a meeting—as will happen at times—a few eloquent and heart-stirring words from her have been sufficient to raise the courage and revive the interest.

† Mrs. Peter A. Taylor, Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Lucas, Miss Biggs, Miss Rhoda Garrett, Miss Jessie Boucherett, Mrs. Arthur Arnold, Miss Frances Power Cobbe, Lady Harberton, Mrs. Pennington, Miss Helen Taylor, step-daughter of John Stuart Mill, Miss Henrietta Müller, member of the London school-board, and others.

‡ Mrs. Jacob Bright, Miss Becker, Mrs. Scatcherd, Miss Corbutt, Mr. Steinthal, Mrs. Thomasson, and others.

§ Led by Mrs. Lillias Ashworth Hallett, Mrs. Helen Bright Clark, niece and daughter of John Bright, Mrs. Beddoe, Miss Snyder, Miss Estlin, the Priestman sisters, Miss Blackburn and Miss Colby. Eliza Sturge, Mrs. Ashford, Mrs. Matthews, Mrs. Ann Comen and Mrs. Alfred Osler, niece of Mrs. Peter Taylor, are the chief Birmingham and Nottingham workers.

Digitized by Google

The municipal elections occur in England every November, and our custom in some towns was to call meetings of the women householders in every ward in which there was a contest, to explain to them the responsibilities resting upon the voters, and after an earnest address from some one of the ladies, to invite the respective candidates to speak. By these means not only was the interest of the women awakened in local politics, but the candidates themselves were reminded of the interests of an important section of their constituencies.

With the beginning of 1880, came again the promise of a reform bill. The majority of the Liberal members of the House of Commons had pledged themselves to their constituents in its favor. But as our enemies were still reiterating that women themselves did not care for the franchise, some further proof of their sympathy was in order. The first great demonstration in favor of women was held in Free Trade Hall, Manchester, which seats about 5,000 people, February 3, where women were admitted free, and seats reserved for men in the gallery at 2s. 6d. each. This arrangement was adopted to make it a meeting of women. One hundred gentlemen were present besides the reporters.

The purpose of the demonstration had been explained at preliminary ward meetings to which men and women came in crowds. On the night in question the scene exceeded the most sanguine expectations. Those who had witnessed the great free trade gatherings which assembled to hear Charles Villiers, Richard Cobden and John Bright, never saw a more enthusiastic audience. Mrs. Duncan McLaren of Edinburgh, who had been invited to preside, took her seat followed by an array of distinguished women, such as had never before graced any platform in the history of the three kingdoms, while the vast area and galleries were crowded with women of wealth and culture; factory women, shop-keepers and hard toilers of every station were also there. Some had walked twenty miles to attend that great meeting. They sat on the steps of the platform, climbed on every coigne of vantage, stood in dense masses in every aisle and corner. A large over-flow meeting was also held in the neighboring Memorial Hall over which Mrs. Lucas presided, but even this could not accommodate all who came, and thousands went away disappointed. It was truly a marvelous meeting, grand in its numbers, grand in the enthusiasm which had brought so many thousands together unattracted by

Digitized by Google

the names of any distinguished speakers, to sympathize with each other in a great national movement, and to proclaim unity of action until it was gained; and it was grand also in the impressiveness of the words that were uttered. The president in her clear grave tones which were heard in the breathless stillness over that large assembly, said:

> It seems like a dream. But only a grave reality could have brought so many women together. Need we wonder that the beneficent designs of Providence have been so imperfectly carried out when only one-half the intellect and heart of the nation have hitherto been called into action, and the powers of the other half have been almost wholly suppressed? Women are learning along with good men that politics in the true sense has to do with human interests at large.

When Mrs. McLaren had concluded, one speaker after another, gave her special testimony in favor of the necessity of obtaining representation. The number was so great that no one was allowed more than ten minutes.*

This demonstration was quickly followed by others that were every way as successful. In connection with one at St James' Hall, London, over which Viscountess Harberton presided, a procession of working women marched through the streets with a banner on which was inscribed "We're far too low to vote the tax; we're not too low to pay." Here also an overflow meeting was held to accommodate the numbers that could not be admitted into the hall. On November 4, the same scene was repeated at the Colston Hall, Bristol, and Mrs. Beddoe, the wife of a popular physician in that city presided, and on November 11, the last demonstration of that year was convened in the Albert Hall, Nottingham, where Mrs. Lucas took the chair. The following year saw no relaxation in these efforts. The Birmingham demonstration took place on February 22, 1881. It was a most inclement night and great fears had been entertained that it would prove a failure, but nothing had power to keep the crowds of women away or to lessen their enthusiasm. Mrs. Crosskey, the wife of Dr. Crosskey, one of the most respected of the Birmingham Liberal leaders, presided. The next was in St.

* Lady Harberton, Mrs. Scatcherd, Mrs. Ashworth Hallet, Mrs. Josephine Butler, Mrs. Ellis, Miss Eliza Sturge, Mrs. Wellstood (Edinburgh), Mrs. Haslam (Dublin), Miss Becker, Mrs. Pearson, Miss Jessie Craigen, Miss Helena Downing, Miss Lucy Wilson, Mrs. Nichols (Edinburgh), Mrs. O'Brien, and in the overflow meeting Mrs. Lucas and Miss Biggs. At the close of the meeting the enthusiastic and prolonged cheering which rose from the crowd, the cordial hand-shakes of utter strangers with words of encouragement and sympathy brought tears to the eyes of many who had the privilege of being present on that occasion.

Digitized by Google

George's Hall, Bradford, on November 22, and here again Mrs. McLaren took the chair, and said:

We are here to-night in the spirit of self-sacrifice. We have had our sorrows in working on this question. We are here because we know there are on our statute books unjust laws which subject many women to sorrow and suffering, and the fact that we have worked our way to such a platform proves that women are capable of holding a political position, and ought to have a voice in our national affairs. We cannot rest contented under the consciousness of injustice because there are women who accept it as their natural condition. We feel it our duty to arouse our sex everywhere to a sense of their high destiny. The inspiration for this work has come from a higher source than ourselves, and we have had often to feel that God does not leave his children to fight their battles alone.

In 1882 there were two more demonstrations. The first was in Albert Hall, Sheffield, on February 27, Lady Harberton presiding, and it was crowded to overflowing with women of all ranks and conditions of society. The demonstration at Glasgow was on November 3, and no way inferior to the other in brilliancy and interest.*

These demonstrations conclusively proved that the suffrage is desired, not only by a few educated women, the leaders of the movement, but by the great masses of the hard-working women. They proved also woman's political capacity and organizing power. No body of persons could possibly do more to manifest their desire for political liberty than the women who have organized and attended these demonstrations. So far as I am aware no such meetings have been attempted by the agricultural laborers over whose enfranchisement the House of Commons has been so deeply exercised, and though the absence of interest which these classes of men have as a whole shown in the question of the franchise is no argument for depriving them of it, the political knowledge and aspirations that women have shown for more than fifteen years ought to count for something in establishing their claim.

The session of 1880 was broken, and the dissolution of parliament in March, the general election which followed, the change in the government and the consequent press of public affairs,

* Mrs. McLaren occupied the chair and was accompanied by Mrs. Nichol, Miss Wigham, Miss Tod, Mrs. Charles McLaren, Miss Craigen, Miss Becker, Miss Beddoe, Mrs. Shearer (formerly Miss Helena Downing), Miss Flora Stevenson, Mrs. Wellstood, Miss Annie Stoddart, Mrs. Burton and a distinguished visitor from New York, Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who was able on this visit to England to estimate the wide difference in the position of women since the time—more than forty years before—she had been refused a seat as a delegate in the World's Anti-Slavery Convention in London.

Digitized by Google

made it impossible to bring forward any measure for the suffrage, but the principle was most splendidly and triumphantly vindicated in the ancient kingdom of the Isle of Man which has an independent government dating from the time of its first colonization under the vikings. It has in modern times its elective house which is called the House of Keys and is equivalent to the Commons. Its Upper House consists of the attorney-general, the clerk of the rolls, the bishop, two judges (or deemsters) and other officials. It enacts its own laws and imposes its own taxes, but is subject to imperial control by requiring the sanction of the queen before any law can come into effect. Some few years ago the franchise was felt to be too restricted, and a movement was set on foot which culminated in 1880 in a bill to extend the franchise to every male person who was a householder. Mr. Richard Sherwood, who five years previously had brought forward a similar motion, moved an amendment to omit the word "male" for the purpose of extending the franchise to women who possessed the requisite qualification, which was carried by 16 to 3, a vote of two-thirds of the whole body of the House of Keys. It then went before the Council which refused the franchise to female occupiers and lodgers, though agreeing to give it to all female owners of real estate of £4 annual value. Thus modified the bill was sent back to the House of Keys which gave up the lodger franchise but adhered to that for occupiers. The bill thus altered was again sent back to the Council and again returned with a message that the Council refused to come to an agreement. The Keys then proposed a compromise, limiting the qualification to woman occupiers of £20 a year. This again was refused, and the Council were prepared to reject the bill altogether. Sooner than lose the whole, the Keys assented, signing, however, a protest in which they stated that they had complied simply to secure a part of a just principle rather than lose the whole. The act was signed by the governor, the Keys and the Council on December 21, received the royal assent on January 5, 1881, and was immediately afterwards, according to ancient custom, proclaimed as law on the Tynwald Hill.

Fully to estimate this victory, it must be remembered that the vote thus gained is the complete parliamentary franchise. Though the total area of the island is so small and though only those women who were absolutely owners of property were enfranchised, they numbered about 700. The law came into opera-

Digitized by Google

tion immediately, and the election began March 21. The women voted in considerable numbers, and were, as an eye-witness states, without exception quite intelligent and business like in this procedure. At the polling stations, the first persons who recorded their votes were women. We may mention in proof of their political gratitude that in the district where Mr. Sherwood was one of the candidates, every woman, whatever her party, voted for his reëlection.

Just before the opening of parliament in 1881, Mr. Courtney accepted a position in the administration, which rendered it impossible for him to continue in charge of any independent measure. By his advice, application was made to Mr. Hugh Mason, member for Ashton under Lyme. But the state of public business during the session never permitted the resolution to be discussed. The same disappointment occurred in the session of 1882—the difficulties in Ireland and Egypt occupying the attention of the government and the country to an extent which almost precluded any measure of domestic reform. Nevertheless, by constant and arduous efforts, these two years witnessed the passing of the Municipal Franchise bill for Scotland.

The Municipal Franchise act of 1869 applied to English women only. Early in the session of 1881, Dr. Cameron, member for Glasgow, introduced a bill to assimilate the position of Scottish women to that which their English sisters had enjoyed for twelve years. The bill passed the House of Commons before Easter, and was then brought forward in the House of Lords by the Earl of Camperdown, passed May 13, and received the royal assent June 3. This law applied only to women rate-payers of the royal and parliamentary burghs, and did not extend to the police burghs, the populous places endowed with powers of local self-government under the general Police and Improvement act of 1862. A request was sent to Mr. Cameron to exert himself for a similar extension of the franchise to the women of the police burghs, and he answered by introducing in the following year, 1882, another act which gave to all women rate-payers the right, not merely of voting at elections of burgh commissioners, but also of voting with the other inhabitants as to whether a populous place should be constituted a police burgh.

The election under these new measures was in November, 1882, and then Scottish women voted for the first time, excepting of course in school-board elections. The result was entirely satis-

Digitized by Google

factory, though the number of women who voted varied greatly —in some places where no special interest attached to the election none came to vote, while in others they voted in equal proportion with the men, and in a few towns nearly every woman whose name was on the register voted. The passing of these two franchise bills was an undoubted triumph of the women's suffrage party. As one of the opponents in the debate of July, 1883, scornfully observed, "Had it not been for the question of women's suffrage being agitated throughout the country at the time, we should not have heard a syllable of the Scottish women's franchise bill," a sneering admission which we willingly construe into compliment.

The year 1882 also witnessed the passing of the Married Women's Property act, whose immense benefits can hardly be estimated, and we may confidently assert that but for the unceasing agitation of the friends of women's suffrage, another quarter of a century would have been suffered to pass without bringing in this tardy measure of justice.*

We now come to the session of 1883, inoperative as far as actual legislation was concerned, but rich in its augury for the future. Already in April the improved temper of the House on questions in which women were concerned, had been shown by the brilliant majority that voted with the Rt. Hon. Mr. Stansfeld for the suppression of the Contagious Diseases acts which have so long stained the English statute book. Early in May a memorial to Mr. Gladstone was signed by 110 Liberal members of parliament, unconnected with the government, in which they stated:

That in the opinion of your memorialists no measure for the assimilation of the county and borough franchise will be satisfactory unless it contain provisions for extending the suffrage without distinction of sex to all persons who possess the statutory qualifications for the parliamentary franchise.

---

* Married Women's Property Committee.—The committee, at the time of the final meeting, November 18, 1882, consisted of the following ladies and gentlemen: Mrs. Addey; Mr. Arthur Arnold, M. P.; Mrs. Arthur Arnold; Mr. Jacob Bright, M. P.; Mrs. Josephine E. Butler; Mr. Thomas Chorlton; Mr. L. H. Courtney, M. P.; Sir C. W. Dilke, Bart., M. P.; Rev. Alfred Dewes, D.D., LL.D.; Mrs. Gell; Lady Goldsmid; Rev. Septimus Hansard; Mr. Thomas Hare; Miss Ida Hardcastle; Mrs. Hodgson; Mr. William Malleson; Mrs. Moore; Mr. H. N. Mozley; Dr. Pankhurst; Mrs. Pankhurst; Mrs. Shearer; Mrs. Sutcliffe; Mr. P. A. Taylor, M. P.; Mrs. P. A. Taylor; Mrs. Venturi; Miss Alice Wilson; Miss Lucy Wilson; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Jacob Bright. *Secretary*, Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy.

The immediate passage of this bill was in a large measure due to Mrs. Jacob Bright, who was unwearied in her efforts, in rolling up petitions, scattering tracts, holding meetings, and in company with her husband having private interviews with members of parliament. For ten consecutive years she gave her special attention to this bill. I had the pleasure of attending the meeting of congratulation November 18, and heard a very charming address from Mrs. Bright on the success of the measure. Mr. Jacob Bright and other members of the committee spoke with equal effect.—[E. C. S.

Digitized by Google

This memorial was a most remarkable manifestation of the support which members on the Liberal side of the House are pledged to give to the principle of justice to women. Nor are we wanting in Conservative support. Sir Stafford Northcote, has always given his friendly approval to the movement, and has very recently repeated his assurances of coöperation in answer to a deputation of ladies who waited on him. After repeated balloting, Mr. Mason obtained a day, July 6, on which to bring forward his resolution. It was thus worded:

That in the opinion of this House the parliamentary franchise should be extended to women who possess the qualifications which entitle men to vote, and who, in all matters of local government have the right of voting.

Mr. Edward Leatham, also a Liberal, gave notice to oppose the resolution affirming with a curious liberalism, that "it is undesirable to change the immemorial basis of the franchise, which is that men only shall be qualified to elect members to serve in this House." Thus after a silence of four years, years of apparent inertia, but really fraught with progress, the debate once again revived in parliament. Mr. Jacob Bright said:

They have told us women can get what they want without the franchise. That used to be said of working men—but since they have had a vote, members in every part of the House have had a generosity and sympathy and courage in all matters affecting working men which they never had before. Precisely the same effect would follow if you gave women the franchise. I admit that women have gained much without the franchise, and I will tell the House when that gain began: It began with the introduction of the question of women's suffrage to the House, and the gain has been mainly due to the awakening intelligence of women on political questions owing to the wide-spread agitation and the demand for women's suffrage. They have gained without the franchise, municipal votes, school-board votes, the right to sit on school-boards, the magnificent act of last year—an act which ought to confer lasting fame on the present lord chancellor—the Married Women's Property act. And owing to the untiring energy of the right honorable member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld), they have succeeded in inflicting a blow on an act of parliament * more unjust to women than anything which has ever been passed, a blow from which that act will never recover. These things have been gained without the franchise. But who will tell me they would not have gained them sooner, with less heart-breaking labor, if they had had the political franchise?

Mr. Courtney also addressed the House in stirring words. The result was most encouraging. Four years had passed since a

* The Contagious Diseases acts.

Digitized by Google

division had been taken, and the enormous majority against us which in so many divisions had maintained its strength had dwindled to only 16. A total of 164, including tellers and pairs supported the resolution against an opposition of only 180. If the Liberal side of the House had only been canvassed on this occasion it would have been a victory, as 119 Liberals voted for it and paired, and only 75 against it.

With the close of the session the question was transferred to the country, and the events of the autumn made it amply evident that the majority of Liberals were in favor of extending the parliamentary suffrage to women. A great conference was held in October at Leeds, where delegates from between 500 and 600 Liberal organizations were present. Fully 2,000 delegates were present at the first meeting. After a long discussion upon the coming Reform bill, the Rev. T. Crosskey, of Birmingham, proposed a rider to the resolution which would include women's suffrage, as follows:

Resolved, That, in order to meet the just expectations of the country, and to fulfill the pledges given at the last general election, this conference is of opinion that a measure for the extension of the franchise should confer on householders in the counties the same electoral rights as those enjoyed by householders in parliamentary boroughs; *and that, in the opinion of this meeting, any measure for the extension of the suffrage should confer the franchise upon women, who, possessing the qualifications which entitle men to vote, have now the right of voting in all matters of local government.*

Mr. Walter McLaren seconded Dr. Crosskey in an able speech, and Miss Jane Cobden (daughter of the late Richard Cobden) who was sitting on the platform, and who had been appointed delegate from the Liberal association of Midhurst, supported the resolution. She begged them, representing as they did the Liberal principles of all England, to give it their hearty support. This was a continuation of the struggle in which Liberals had taken part during the last fifty years, and she trusted they would be true to their principles.

Mrs. Helen Bright Clark, the daughter of Mr. John Bright, M. P., who had been appointed delegate from one of the few Liberal associations which comprise women among their members, said:

There was in this country a considerable and increasing number of earnest women of strong liberal convictions, who felt keenly the total exclusion of their sex from the parliamentary suffrage. Their hope was, of course, in the Liberal party, though all of its members were not yet converted to true liberalism. The Liberal women would not rest satisfied until there was throughout the United Kingdom a real and honest house-

Digitized by Google

hold suffrage. They knew that they were weak in the cabinet, and they regretted to know that some of the most eminent leaders of the Liberal party were not in this matter wholly their friends. These leaders had fears which she thought the future would show to have been unfounded. But she could venture to say on behalf of the Liberal women of England that they were not unmindful of the past, and were not ungrateful for the services which these men rendered and were prepared to render to their country. Women were grateful. They sympathized with the efforts of Liberal statesmen in the past, and they knew how faithfully and loyally to follow. But they felt that they must sometimes originate for themselves, and they dared not blindly and with absolute faith follow any man, however great or however justly and deeply beloved. Further, she could say that, with the result of the high political teaching they had had in the past, they would endeavor faithfully, intelligently and with what ability was given to them, to uphold those great principles of justice, and trust in the people which she believed had made the Liberal party what it was, and which alone were capable of lifting it to the highest triumphs in the future.

There were enthusiastic cheers when Mrs. Clark had finished speaking. The historical interest, the self-evident justice of the plea brought forward by the daughters of the great reform leaders on behalf of the continuance of the grand cause of freedom for which their fathers had so bravely battled, went to the hearts of the crowded assembly. Delegates who had come determined to vote against the resolution—the "monstrous political fad," as one of our opponents in parliament had called it—said, almost with tears in their eyes, "We can't vote against the daughters of Bright and Cobden," and when the resolution with the rider was put, a forest of hands went up in its support, and in that vast crowd there were only about thirty dissentients. The following evening Miss Jane Cobden and Mrs. Scatcherd addressed an open-air meeting of 30,000 men who could not gain access to Victoria Hall, where John Bright was speaking on the franchise for men, and a unanimous cheer was given in favor of women's suffrage.

This was only the beginning of the autumn campaign among the Liberal associations. The general committee of the Edinburgh United Liberal Association met on November 16, 1883, in the Oddfellows' Hall (No. 2), Forrest road, Edinburgh, to consider the questions of the Local Government Board (Scotland) bill, the equalization of the burgh and county franchise, and the extension of the parliamentary vote to women householders. After the two first subjects had been considered, the following resolution, moved by ex-Bailie Lewis, was adopted:

Resolved, That this meeting regards the extension of the parliamentary franchise to female householders as just and reasonable, and would hail with satisfaction the in-

Digitized by Google

troduction of a government measure which would confer the parliamentary franchise upon all female householders, whether resident in counties or burghs.

November 21, a meeting of the general council of the Manchester Liberal Association was held in the Memorial Hall to consider the resolutions passed at the Leeds conference. Mr. J. A. Beith presided. Mr. J. W. Southern moved the following resolution:

Resolved, That in order to meet the just expectation of the country and to fulfill the pledges given at the last general election, this council is of opinion that a measure for the extension of the franchise should confer on householders and lodgers in the counties the same electoral rights as those enjoyed by householders and lodgers in parliamentary boroughs, and should extend to Ireland the franchise enjoyed by Great Britain; and that, in the opinion of this meeting, any measure for the extension of the suffrage should confer the franchise upon women who, possessing the qualifications which should entitle men to vote, have now the right of voting in all matters of local government.

An amendment to strike out the portion relating to women having been rejected, the resolution was carried unanimously. November 26, the sixth annual meeting of the National Liberal Association was held at Bristol. Here also one or two ladies were present as delegates. After a resolution affirming the urgency of the question of parliamentary reform had been passed, Mr. Lewis Fry, M. P., moved:

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting any measure for the extension of the suffrage should confer the franchise upon women who, possessing the qualifications which entitle men to vote, have now the right of voting in all matters of local government.

The resolution was seconded by Dr. Caldicott, supported in excellent speeches by Mrs. Walter McLaren and Mrs. Ashworth Hallett, and carried by a majority of five. Many other Liberal associations of less importance, during the autumn, affirmed the principle of women's suffrage. All the political associations in Ulster, both Conservative and Liberal, either formally or informally signified their acceptance of the principle. In the progress of the movement it was very encouraging to see so many brave women * of ability crowding our platform, conscientiously devoting their time, talents and money to this sacred cause, ready and able to fill the vacant places that time must make in our ranks.

The year 1884 opened with good hopes. There was the immediate prospect of a reform bill, intended so to widen the representation of the people as to fix it on a satisfactory basis for an-

* Miss Henrietta Müller and her sister Mrs. Eva McLaren, Mrs. Ormiston Chant, Mrs. Ashton Dilke, Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd, Mrs. Charles McLaren, Miss Florence Balgarnie, Miss Laura Whittle, Florence and Lillie Stacpoole, Miss Frances Lord, Mrs. Stanton Blatch and Mrs. Helena Downing Shearer.

Digitized by Google

other generation at least. The time seemed opportune for the attainment of women's suffrage. There had been repeated proof that the majority of the Liberal party in the country admit the justice of their claims; there were renewed promises of support on the part of members of parliament of all shades of political opinion. Many times the claims of women for the franchise have been set aside by the assertion that so important a privilege could not be granted till the time came for the general re-settlement of the question. That time appeared to have come. A considerable extension of the suffrage was to be granted, so as to include another 2,000,000 of unenfranchised men; what better time to recognize the claims of women who already possessed the qualifications of property or residence which alone in England give the vote? A few persons expected that the government Reform bill would contain a clause relating to women, but this expectation was not generally shared. It was well known that strong differences of opinion existed in the cabinet which would render it well-nigh impossible for the government to introduce the question as one of their own; and though there may have been disappointment, there was no great surprise when the Franchise bill, on its introduction, was found to contain no reference to women.

Meanwhile there had been a change in the leadership of the movement. Mr. Hugh Mason having intimated his intention to resign the conduct of the measure, Mr. William Woodall, member of parliament for Stoke-on-Trent, consented to take charge of it. A conference of friendly members of parliament was held in the House of Commons on February 7, and it was then agreed that should the government Franchise bill not extend to women, an amendment with the object of including them should be moved at some stage of the discussion in the House of Commons. Mr. Woodall agreed to take charge of this amendment.

On February 28, Mr. Gladstone moved in the House of Commons for leave to bring in a bill to amend the representation of the people. The forms of the House did not admit of Mr. Woodall's amendment being placed on the notice-paper until after the second reading of the bill, but during the adjourned debate on the second reading he found an opportunity to announce that he would move his proposed clause while the House was in committee on the bill. He remarked that the fundamental principle of the bill as it was described by the prime minister was to give a vote to every household, but as there was no provision for

Digitized by Google

giving the franchise to such householders if they happened to be women, he intended to propose the insertion of a clause to remedy this omission. The clause was:

For all purposes connected with and having reference to the right of voting in the election of members of parliament, words in the Representation of the People acts importing the masculine gender include women.

A careful analysis of the opinions of members of the House of Commons gave every promise that such an amendment might be successful. The views of 485 out of the entire number were known, while 155 had never expressed an opinion, about one-third of these being new members. Of those whose opinions were known, 249, or a majority, had expressed themselves in favor of women's suffrage, 236 had expressed themselves against it. The preponderance of support had hitherto always been among the Liberal ranks, for though the leaders of the Conservative party had given the principle their hearty approval, their example had not been followed by their partisans. It appeared probable therefore that, if the government held itself neutral on the occasion and permitted fair play, the amendment would be carried mainly by means of their own friends.

During the spring, meetings of considerable importance were held in the country. The first was at Edinburgh on March 22. It was a demonstration of women inferior in no respect to those we have had occasion to chronicle of former years. No more imposing assemblage for a political object had ever been seen in Edinburgh. The largest hall in the city—that of the United Presbyterian Synod—was crowded to the doors, and an overflow meeting was held in the Presbytery Hall. Banners were hung above the platform and a roll inscribed with the names of the principal supporters of the movement was conspicuously displayed.* Lady Harberton occupied the chair and was accompanied by the delegates.† Letters ‡ of sympathy were read by Miss Wigham, the secretary.

* The inscription was: "Women Claim Equal Justice with Men. *The Friends of Women:* Henry Fawcett, John Stuart Mill, Chas. Cameron, Jacob Bright, Leonard Courtney, Duncan McLaren, George Anderson, James Stansfeld, Sir Wilfred Lawson, J. P. Thomasson."

† Mrs. Buchanan, Curriehill; Mrs. O. Scatcherd, Leeds; Mrs. Nichol, Mrs. M'Laren, Miss Wigham, Dr. A. M'Laren, Miss Hunter, Mrs. Paterson, Miss L. Stevenson, Miss F. Stevenson, Mrs. M'Queen, Mrs. Hope, Mrs. M. Miller, Miss S. S. Mair, Miss R. Smith, Miss E. Kirkland, Mrs. Raeburn and Miss A. G. Wyld, Edinburgh; Mrs. O. Chant, Mrs. Hodgson, Bonaly; Miss Tod, Belfast; Mrs. Somerville, Dalkeith; Mrs. Forbes, Loanhead; Mrs. D. Greig, Mrs. Erskine Murray, Miss Greig, Mrs. Lindsay, Miss Barton and Mrs. A. Campbell, Glasgow; Miss Simpson, Miss Caldwell, Portobello; Mrs. M'Kinnel, Dumfries; Mrs. M'Cormick, Manchester; Miss Burton, Liberton; Miss Balgarnie, Scarborough; Miss A. S. Smith, Gorebridge; Miss Drew, Helensburgh; Miss Blair, Girvan; Mrs. Smith, Mrs. F. Smith, Bothwell.

‡ Miss Helen Taylor, Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. Fawcett, London; Mrs. Thomasson, Bolton; Miss Orme, Miss Jane Cobden, Miss C. A. Biggs, Mrs. Fenwick-Miller, Mrs. Ashton Dilke, London; Mrs. Hal-

Digitized by Google

LADY HARBERTON said: If our legislators say taxation and representation should go together, it is right that they should give expression to this opinion fairly and openly, and at all times and seasons insist upon it that those women who are ratepayers and who are in fact heads of households, ought not to be excluded from the privilege of voting for a member to represent them in the House of Commons. This is no question of women usurping the place of men or any trivialities of that kind; it is a much more serious matter. The exclusion of women from the right to representation has already led to laws being passed about them and their interests, that I do not hesitate to call a disgrace to humanity. [Cheers.] That they are not more commonly recognized as such is due, I think, to two causes. One thing is that women of the upper classes, who are usually wealthy, are able by the aid of money so to hedge themselves around with barriers to oppose the inconveniences placed upon women by the laws, that they very often do not feel them so much; while women of the classes who are not wealthy are so crushed and oppressed by the working of these laws that they are unable to take the first step, which is agitation, towards getting them altered or repealed. [Cheers.] It often seems to me that another reason why women themselves are not more enthusiastic upon this question of the franchise is, that from their earliest childhood they are taught that the first duty of women is unselfishness, the putting of their own interests and wishes behind those of others. Any discussion of this great question only brings forth hysterical clamor that "women should stay at Home"—with a very big "H." [Laughter and cheers.] Well, I have been examining a little into the conduct of those ladies who do stay at home so much, and what do I find? Why, that they rush about and seem like the changing colors of the kaleidoscope, now collecting at a bazaar, anon singing at a concert, with no end of publicity [cheers], but as long as no rational object is promoted by their action, it is all counted as staying quietly home in the nursery, whether they have children or not. That is their notion of being "thoroughly domesticated." [Laughter.] Now, much as I could wish myself that men had done their duty and agitated for us, in this case it is an undeniable fact that they have not shown that readiness, I may say eagerness, to begin that one could have wished; it therefore changes at once into one of those duties men have not seen their way to do, and so becomes of necessity women's work.

A series of meetings * after this was held in Bath, Newcastle and London.

---

lett, Bath; Miss Becker, Manchester; Miss Priestman, Bristol; Mrs. Helen Bright Clark, Street, Somersetshire; Miss Müller, London; Mrs. Eva M'Laren, Bradford; Mrs. Charles M'Laren, London; Mrs. Pochin, Bodnant, Conway; Mrs. Campbell, Tilliechewan Castle; Mrs. Charteris, Edinburgh; Mrs. Edward Caird, Mrs. Young, Mrs. Kinnear, Mrs. A. B. M'Grigor, Glasgow; Mrs. Arthur, Barshaw, Paisley; Mrs. Readdie, Perth; Miss Birrel, Cupar; Mrs. Dunn, Aberdeen; Miss Duncan, Foxhall; Miss Chalmers, Slateford; Miss Smith, Linlithgow; Miss Macrobie, Bridge of Allan; Mrs. Ritchie, Mrs. Greenlees, Glasgow; Mrs. Ord, Nesbit, Kelso; Mrs. Gordon, Nairn; Mrs. Gerrard, Aberdeen; Miss Stoddart, Kelso; Mrs. Robertson. Paisley; Miss Maitland, Corstorphine.

* EDINBURGH.—The first resolution was moved by Miss Tod and seconded by Mrs. Scatcherd:

Resolved, That this meeting, whilst thanking the 110 Liberal members who signed the memorial to Mr. Gladstone to the effect that no measure of refom would be satisfactory which did not recognize the claims of women householders, trusts that since the bill unjustly excludes them, these members will be

Digitized by Google

The audiences heartily concurred with the speakers that the time when a reform bill was before parliament was the fittest and most opportune moment in which to press forward the claim of women to representation.

We may observe once again with pride, how hearty and cheering have always been the sympathy and assistance that men have rendered to women in this movement in England. At no time has there been a possibility of a feeling of bitterness between the sexes or a conviction that their interests were antagonistic, for the plain reason that there have always been men working side by side with women. Our suffrage meetings have been attended and supported by political leaders, members of parliament, town councils or prominent movers among the working-class associations. Except in the great demonstrations, which for special reasons were confined exclusively to women, our movement has formed part of the ordinary political life of the country.

The *Suffrage Journal* for May contains a very carefully drawn calculation of the number of women in the United Kingdom who will probably receive the franchise if the wider qualifications contained in the present Franchise bill become law. It must be remembered that there are now 3,330,720 more houses than electors in the British Isles. In boroughs where household suffrage already prevails for men, the unrepresented houses should guide us to a tolerably correct estimate of the number of women householders. We may say that practically there are 446,000 houses in the boroughs of England and Wales, whose inhabitant in each case being a woman, is unrepresented. The proportion varies

---

faithful to the convictions expressed in that memorial, and will support any amendment to the bill which has for its object the enfranchisement of duly qualified women.

The second resolution, a memorial to Mr. Gladstone, was moved by Miss Flora Stevenson, member of the Edinburgh school-board, seconded by Mrs. McLaren and supported by Miss Florence Balgarnie and Mrs. Ormiston Chant. The third resolution, the adoption of petitions, was moved by Miss S. S. Mair, a grand-niece of Mrs. Siddons, and Mrs. Lindsay of Glasgow.

BATH, GUILD HALL.—Presided over by the mayor. Among other speakers were Mrs. Beddoe, Miss Becker, Mrs. Jeffrey and Mrs. Ashworth Hallet.

NEWCASTLE, TOWN HALL.—Followed on April 21, under the presidency of the mayor. The crowd was so great that an overflow meeting had to be arranged. The speakers were Mrs. Ashton Dilke, Miss Tod, Mrs. Eva McLaren and Mrs. Scatcherd. The audience was largely composed of miners and working people, and the enthusiasm manifested was striking. A Newcastle paper reports that this was the first occasion on which Mrs. Ashton Dilke had appeared in public since her husband's death, and tears glistened in many eyes as the men who were his constituents welcomed her among them once more. Some miners walked twelve miles to hear her and twelve miles back after the meeting, who had to go down the pit at 3 o'clock next morning. Some could not get in, and pleaded piteously for an overflow meeting. "We have come a long way to hear Mistress Dilke; do bring her." Some women after hearing Miss Tod said: "She's worth hearing twice, is that," and insisted on following her to the overflow meeting.

LONDON, ST. JAMES HALL.—Three days later there was a great meeting presided over by Sir Richard Temple G. C. S. I., and addressed by Mr. W. Summers, M. P., Mrs. Fawcett, the Rt. Hon. Jas. Stansfeld, M. P., Mrs. Charles McLaren, Mr. Woodall, M. P., Mr. J. Rankin, M. P., Miss Tod, Mr. J. R. Hollond, M. P., Viscountess Harberton and Miss Jane Cobden.

Digitized by Google

much in different localities; in the city of Bath one-fourth the householders are women. If we calculate that one house in every six in the boroughs is occupied by a woman, we find that 349,746 is the probable number to be enfranchised there.

For the counties there are no means of arriving at so close a result, but by estimating the proportion of women householders to be the same as that of women land-owners, or one in seven, we reach the fairly approximate calculation of 390,434, in the counties. The same method of calculation applies to Scotland and to Ireland, where, however, the proportion of woman land-owners is one in eight.*

In order to show that the desire for the suffrage was not confined to any one rank, class or profession of women, a circular was signed by a large number of ladies and sent to every member of both houses of parliament. It was as follows:

SIR: We desire to call your attention to the claim of women who are heads of households to be included in the operation of the government Franchise bill.

Women have continuously presented this claim before parliament and the country since the Reform bill of 1867. The introduction of a measure declared by the government to be intended to deal with the franchise in an exhaustive manner, renders it especially necessary now to urge it upon the attention of parliament.

We respectfully represent that the claim of duly qualified women for admission within the pale of the constitution is fully as pressing as that of the agricultural laborer, and that the body of electors who would thereby be added to the constituencies, would be at least equal in general and political intelligence to the great body of agricultural and other laborers who are to be enfranchised by the government bill.

Among this body would be found women land-owners, who form one-seventh of the land proprietors of the country; women of means and position living on their own property; schoolmistresses and other teachers; women engaged in professional, literary and artistic pursuits; women farmers, merchants, manufacturers and shopkeepers; besides large num-

* The result is as follows:

		No. of Inhabited Houses.		Estimated No. of Women Householders.	
ENGLAND AND WALES.					
	Boroughs,	2,098,476		349,746	
	Counties,	2,733,043		390,434	
			4,831,519		740,180
SCOTLAND.					
	Boroughs,	329,328		54,888	
	Counties,	409,677		58,525	
			739,005		113,413
IRELAND.					
	Boroughs,	129,837		21,339	
	Counties,	784,571		98,034	
			914,108		119,373
					972,966

Digitized by Google

bers of self-supporting women engaged in industrial occupations. The continued exclusion of so large a proportion of the property, industry and intelligence of the country from all representation in the legislature is injurious to those excluded, and to the community at large.

Several bills having special reference to the interests and *status* of women have been introduced in parliament during the present session. This affords a powerful reason for the immediate enfranchisement of women, in order that members of parliament may have the same sense of responsibility towards the class affected by them whether dealing with questions relating to women or to men.

For these and other reasons we earnestly beg that you will give your support to the amendment to be introduced by Mr. Woodall in committee on the Representation of the People bill for including women householders in its operation. We are, sir, yours faithfully,*

In this circular women of all opinions were represented, but a special circular, signed only by ladies of Conservative views, was sent to the conservative associations. These ladies pointed out that justice to women themselves, and the welfare of the whole community are involved in the admission of the women householders who at this moment are possessed of the existing statutory qualifications:

To bring in a new class, under new conditions, whilst continuing to exclude those who fulfill the present conditions, would be very injurious to those excluded and set a wrong example before the community. Every enlargement of the electoral franchise for men which can now take place necessarily includes many whose interests in the country cannot equal those of the women who now claim it. Their position is already recognized by their possession of every local franchise whatsoever. Justice requires that the principle should be fully carried out by extending to women the right to vote for members of parliament, whose legislation so strongly affects their welfare. Prudence also requires that an important class of educated and philanthropic persons should not be left out, or their claims postponed, when a large addition is likely to be made to the less educated portion of the electorate. We most seriously believe that few things could happen more dangerous for the real happiness of the nation than to permit the opportunity to pass without the admission of legally qualified women within the circle of the constitution.

* Signed by Eveline Portsmouth (Countess of Portsmouth), E. P. Verney (Lady Verney), Florence Nightingale, Anne J. Clough (Newham College), Clara E. L. Rayleigh (Lady Rayleigh), Selina Hogg (Lady Hogg), Anna Swanwick, Julia Camperdown (Countess of Camperdown), Mina E. Holland, (Mrs. John Holland), (Lady) Dorothy Nevill, Millicent Garrett Fawcett, Helen P. Bright Clark, Jane E. Cobden, Elizabeth Adelaide Manning, M. Power (Lady Power), Louisa Colthurst (Dowager Lady Colthurst), Frances E. Hoggan, M. D., Florence Davenport Hill (Poor-law Guardian), Louisa Twining (Poor-law Guardian), Maryanne Donkin (Poor-law Guardian), Rosamond Davenport Hill (M. L. S. B.), Mary Howitt, Maria G. Grey, Emily A. E. Shireff, Deborah Bowring (Lady Bowring), Emily Pfeiffer, Barbara L. S. Bodichon, Augusta Webster, Catherine M. Buckton, Frances M. Buss (North London Collegiate School), Sophia Bryant, B. Sc., Malvira Borchardt (Head Mistress of Devonport High School), Louisa Boucherett, Jessie Boucherett, Margaret Byers (Ladies' Collegiate School, Belfast), Ellice Hopkins.

Digitized by Google

A correspondence also was conducted with Mr. Gladstone by the Bristol Ladies' Liberal Association and others whom they invited to join them, of known Liberal views, urging him to receive a delegation and praying that

It may not in the future be said that women alone were unworthy of any measure of confidence which you so rightly extended even to the humblest and most ignorant men.

Mr. Gladstone declined to receive the deputation, partly on the ground of illness, partly lest the admission of their views might interfere with his plans for the bill. So the day of battle drew on, when a rumor began to be circulated that the government intended to oppose Mr. Woodall's clause, on the ground that its admission might endanger the bill. Strenuous efforts were at the same time made to induce him to withdraw the amendment, and the government whips plainly intimated that the question would not be considered an open one, on which members were to be free to vote according to their convictions, but as one which the government had made up their minds to oppose. With the hope of changing this determination a memorial was signed by seventy-seven members of parliament, and presented to Mr. Gladstone, asking him to leave the introduction of the clause an open question. It represented—

That the Franchise bill being now in committee a favorable opportunity is afforded for the discussion of the amendment for extending its provisions to women, of which notice has been given by Mr. Woodall.

That your memorialists have heard a rumor that her majesty's government have declared against allowing the question to be discussed and decided on its merits, on the ground that the adoption of the proposal might endanger the bill.

That your memorialists are of the opinion that the claim of women who are householders and ratepayers is just and reasonable, and that the time when the House is engaged in amending the law relating to the representation of the people is the proper time for the consideration of this claim.

That during the discussion in committee on the Reform bill of 1867, an amendment for extending its provisions to women was introduced by Mr. John Stuart Mill, and that on that occasion the government of the day offered no opposition to the full and free discussion of the question, and placed no restriction on the free exercise of the judgment of members of their party as to the manner in which they should vote. The tellers appointed against Mr. Mill's motion were not even the government tellers.

That your memorialists earnestly pray that the precedent so instituted may be followed on the present occasion, and that the clause proposed by Mr. Woodall may be submitted to the free and unbiased decision of the House on its own merits.

Digitized by Google

They desire earnestly to express their conviction that the course of allowing the question to be an open one, on which the government is prepared to accept the decision of the House, cannot possibly endanger or prejudice the Franchise bill. In connection with this your memorialists would press on your attention the fact that Mr. Woodall's amendment is in the form of a new clause, and would not therefore come under discussion until the bill as it stands has passed through committee.

This request was refused. On June 9, such unexpected progress was made by the committee of the House of Commons with the Franchise bill that all the government clauses were carried. There were many amendments on the paper which took precedence of Mr. Woodall's, but these were hastily gone through or withdrawn, and in the middle of the morning sitting of June 9, he rose and moved the introduction of his clause. Mr. Woodall's speech was a masterpiece of earnest but temperate reasoning. He was fortunate enough to present an old and well-worn subject in new lights. He said that Mr. Gladstone had affirmed the principle of the measure to be to give every householder a vote, and it would now be his endeavor to pursuade parliament that women were capable citizens, who would meet all the conditions so clearly laid down by the prime minister. Against the charge of inopportunity in bringing the subject forward at this crisis, he reminded the House of Mr. Chamberlain's words on a recent occasion, that it was always opportune to do right.

Mr. Gladstone said there were two questions to be considered. One of these was the question whether women were to be enfranchised, the other whether the enfranchisement should be effected by a clause introduced in committee on the present bill. The second question was that on which he was about to dwell. He deprecated the introduction of new matter into the bill. The cargo which the vessel carried was, in the opinion of the government, as large as she could carry safely. The proposal was a very large one. It did not seem unreasonable to believe that the number of persons in the three kingdoms to be enfranchised by the amendment would be little short of half a million. What was the position in which Mr. Woodall placed the government when he requested them to introduce a completely new subject on which men profoundly differed, and which, it was clear, should receive a full and dispassioned investigation? It was not now practicable to give that investigation. This was one of those questions which it would be intolerable to mix up with purely political and party debates. If there was a subject in the whole compass of human life and experience that was sacred beyond all other subjects it was the character and position of woman. Did his honorable friend ask him to admit that the question deserved the fullest consideration? He gave him that admission freely. Did he ask whether he (Mr. Gladstone) wished to bind the members of the Government or his colleagues in the cabinet with

Digitized by Google

respect to the votes they would give on this question? Certainly not, provided only that they took the subject from the vortex of political contention. He was bound to say, whilst thus free and open on the subject itself, that with regard to the proposal to introduce it into this bill he offered it the strongest opposition in his power, and must disclaim and renounce all responsibility for the measure should Mr. Woodall succeed in inducing the committee to adopt his amendment.

On motion of Lord John Manners the debate was adjourned till June 12.

On the intervening day a meeting was summoned of the general committee of the society. Miss Cobbe first, and Mr. Woodall subsequently, presided, and the following resolutions were passed:

Resolved, That the claim of duly qualified women to the exercise of the suffrage having been continuously presented before parliament and the country since the Reform bill of 1867, this meeting is of opinion that the time when the legislature is again engaged in amending the law relating to the representation of the people is the proper time for the consideration of this claim.

Resolved, That this meeting heartily approves of the amendment which Mr. Woodall has moved in committee on the Franchise bill for extending its provisions to duly qualified women, and pledge themselves to support his action by every means in their power.

Resolved, That they have heard with astonishment that her majesty's government refuse to allow this amendment to be discussed on its merits and to be decided by the free exercise of the judgment of members of the House of Commons, but that the government require their supporters to refrain from such free exercise of their judgment on the alleged ground that the adoption of the proposal would endanger the Franchise bill.

Resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting the exercise of such pressure appears to be an infringement of the privileges of a free parliament and an aggression on the rights of the people. They hold that all sections of the community, whether electors or non-electors, have an indefeasible right to have matters affecting their interests submitted to the unbiased judgment, and decided by the unfettered discretion of the members sent to represent them in parliament.

Resolved, That a declaration signed by 110 Liberal members of the House of Commons was presented last session to Mr. Gladstone which set forth that, in the opinion of the memorialists, no measure for the assimilation of the borough and county franchise could be satisfactory unless it contained provisions for extending the suffrage, without distinction of sex, to all persons who possess the statutory qualifications for the parliamentary franchise.

Resolved, That this meeting calls upon those who signed this declaration, and all other members who believe that the claim of duly qualified women to the parliamentary franchise is reasonable and just, to support the clause moved by Mr. Woodall, in committee on the Franchise bill, for extending its provisions to such women.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to Mr. Gladstone and to every member of parliament.

Resolved, That petitions to both houses of parliament in support of Mr. Woodall's clause be adopted and signed by the chairman on behalf of this meeting.

Some members of parliament who attended this meeting explained that though they were as firmly convinced as ever of the justice of the claim, they could not vote for it after Mr. Glad-

Digitized by Google

stone's distinct declaration that he would abandon the bill if the amendment were passed. On June 12 Lord John Manners resumed the debate. He said:

That although this proposal had never been of a party character, it had always been a political question. There was no question connected with the franchise which had been more thoroughly discussed, threshed and sifted. Guided by every consideration of justice and fairness, of equity, of analogy and experience, he should give it his cordial and unhesitating support.

The next speech of importance was Mr. Stansfeld's. He maintained that the acceptance of the clause by the government would have strengthened rather than weakened the bill, and that its insertion certainly would not have rendered the bill less palatable to the House of Lords:

The principle of this bill is household suffrage. Household suffrage is one of two things—it is either put as a rough test of capable citizenship, or else it means what I will call the family vote. The women to be enfranchised under this clause would be first of all women of property, intelligence and education, having a status in the country; secondly a large class of women of exceptional competency, because having lost the services and support of men who should be the bread-winners and the heads of families, they are obliged to step into their shoes and to take upon themselves the burdens and responsibilities which had previously devolved upon men, and because they have done this with success. I decline either by word or deed to make the admission that these women are less capable citizens than the 2,000,000 whom the right honorable gentleman proposes to enfranchise by this bill. Well, then, let it be the family vote—that is to say, exceptions apart, let the basis of our constitution be that the family, represented by its head, should be the unit of the State. Now that is the idea which recommends and has always recommended itself to my mind. But on what principle, or with what regard to the permanence and stability of that principle, can you exclude the head of the family and give that family no voice, because the head happens to be a woman? If this clause be excluded from the measure, as it will be, this will not be a bill of one principle, but of two principles. It will not be a bill containing only the principle of household suffrage interpreted as the family vote, but one founded on these two principles—first, a male householding vote; and, secondly, the exclusion of the head of the household when the head is a woman. That is a permanent principle of exclusion, and therefore the bill with this clause left out is a declaration for ever against the political emancipation of women.

After some speeches against the motion Colonel King-Harman said:

In the old state of the franchise it was not so much a matter of importance to women whether they possessed votes or not, but now that this

Digitized by Google

bill proposed to create two million new voters of a much lower order than those now exercising the franchise, it became of importance to secure some countervailing advantage. They were told this was a matter which could wait. What were the women to gain by waiting? They had waited for seventeen years during which the subject had been discussed, and now they were told to wait till two million of the common orders had been admitted to a share in the parliamentary management of the country. The honorable member for Huddersfield (Mr. Leatham) had used an argument which he (Colonel King-Harman) thought a most unworthy one, namely, that the franchise was not to be extended to women, because, uuhappily, there are women of a degraded and debased class. Because there were 40,000 of them in this metropolis alone, the remaining women who were pure and virtuous were to be deprived of the power of voting. But would Mr. Leatham guarantee that the 2,000,000 men he proposes to enfranchise shall be perfectly pure and moral men? Would he propose a clause to exclude from the franchise those men who lead and retain in vice and degradation these unfortunate women? No—men may sin and be a power in the State, but when a woman sins not only is she to have no power, but her whole sisterhood are to be excluded from it. He believed that every idea of common sense pointed to the desirability of supporting the amendment, and he therefore had great pleasure in doing so.

There were also excellent speeches from Mr. Cowen (Newcastle), General Alexander, Sir Wilfred Lawson and Mr. Story, and finally from Sir Stafford Northcote the leader of the Conservative opposition. He observed:

That the prime minister had told them that they did not consider this clause to be properly introduced now, because this was not the time for the question. It seemed to him, on the contrary, that it was the very best opportunity for dealing with it, because they were going enormously to increase the electorate, and would, therefore, make the inequality between men and women much greater than it was before. It would be said they were going to extend the property franchise if this amendment were carried. On that issue they were prepared to join and to maintain that it was a right thing, and it was the duty of that House to make proper provision for those classes of property holders now without a vote. Members who had canvassed boroughs would remember that after going into two or three shops and asking for the votes of those who were owners, they have come to one perhaps of the most important shops and have been told, "Oh, it is of no use going in, there is no vote there." Such women are probably of education and gentle character, and perhaps live as widows and take care of their families; they have every right to be consulted as to who should be the man to represent the constituency in which they lived and to take care of their interests and the interests of those dependent on them. That was the ground on which Lord Beaconsfield stood. They had adhered to that ground for several years, and there they stood now.

Digitized by Google

The division took place at a late hour with the result that the clause was defeated by 271 votes to 135, being a majority against it of 136, or two to one. But though such a vote would have been a sore discouragement if it had represented the real opinion of the House, on the present occasion it meant little if anything. The government had sent out a "five-line" whip for its supporters, and so effective had this whip been, combined with Mr. Gladstone's assertion that he would give up the responsibility of the bill if the clause were carried, that 98 Liberals and 6 Home Rulers, known to be supporters of our cause, voted with the government, even Mr. Hugh Mason being among this number, while 34 Liberals and 7 Home Rulers, also friends of ours, were absent from the division. We may safely assume that had the government more wisely left it an open question, upon which members were free to vote according to their consciences, our defeat would have been turned into a victory. On the other hand while our Liberal friends thus voted against the amendment or abstained from voting, the bulk of our supporters in this division were Conservatives, a circumstance unknown in the previous history of the movement.

An important conference of friends and supporters was held the next morning in the Westminster Palace Hotel at which Mr. Stansfeld presided. To use Miss Tod's words:

> Never had a defeated army met in a more victorious mood. There was much indeed to encourage in the degree of importance to which the question had attained. It had risen from a purely speculative into a pressing political question; it had been debated during two days, and it was heartily supported by the Conservative leader.

The speeches at the conference were animated and full of hope for the future. Mr. Stansfeld congratulated the meeting on having made a new departure; their question had become one of practical politics, and they had now to address themselves in all the constituencies to the political organizations.

A magnificent meeting was held in St. James Hall the following week. The hall was densely crowded in every part, and an overflow meeting was arranged for those unable to gain admission. Some of the speakers* proposed as the best measure for agitation, a determined resistance against taxation.†

* Mrs. Lucas presiding, Dr. Garrett Anderson, Miss Becker, Miss Orme, Mrs. Beddoe, Mrs. Scatcherd, Mrs. Eva M'Laren, Mrs. Simcok, Mrs. Stanton Blatch, Mrs. Louisa Stevenson, Miss Balgarnie, Miss Müller, Miss Wilkinson, Mrs. Ashworth Hallett, Miss Tod.

† Miss Müller's spirited protest against taxation without representation, owing to her official reputation as a member of the London school-board, attracted unusual attention. For some time she

Digitized by Google

Repeated attempts to obtain a day for the debate and division were followed by repeated disappointments. The session commenced in November, 1884. Mr. Woodall at once gave notice of a bill. In presenting it to the House, he concluded after consultation with parliamentary friends, to add a clause defining the action of his bill to be limited to unmarried women and widows.* The enacting clause of the bill was as follows:

For all purposes of and incidental to the voting for members to serve in parliament, women shall have the same rights as men, and all enactments relating to or concerned in such elections shall be construed accordingly, provided that nothing in this act shall enable women under coverture to be registered or to vote at such elections.

The addition of this clause excited much discussion. Those in favor of it argued that this limitation would certainly be imposed in committee of the House, which though it was in all probability prepared to give the vote to women possessed of independence, dreaded the extension of faggot votes which would have been the almost inevitable consequence of admitting married women; while the result would be the same whether the limitation clause was introduced by the promoters of the bill or by a parliamentary committee, and it would be more likely to obtain support at the second reading if its intentions were made clear in the beginning. On the other hand it was argued that the principle of giving the vote to women in the same degree that it was given to men, was the basis upon which the whole agitation rested; that marriage was no disqualification to men, and therefore should not prove so to women; and that, though it might be necessary to accept a limitation by parliament, it was not right for the society to lower its standard by proposing a compromise. This divergence in the views of the supporters of the movement was the cause of much discussion in the public press and elsewhere, and unfortunately resulted in the abstention of some of the oldest friends of the cause from working in support of this particular bill, although it was admitted on all sides that if a day could be obtained its chances in a division were very good.

---

kept her doors barred against the coarse minions of the law, but ultimately they entered the house, seized her goods and carried them off to be sold at public auction, but they were bought in by friends next day. Miss Charlotte E. Hall and Miss Babb have protested and resisted taxation for many years.

It is probable that Miss Müller's example will be followed by many others next year. This quiet form of protest used to be very generally followed by members of the society of Friends, and must command the sympathy of our co-workers in the United States, who date their national existence from their refusal to submit to taxation without representation.—[E. C. S.

* The bill was prepared and brought in by Mr. Woodall, Mr. Illingworth, Mr. Coleridge Kennard, Mr. Stansfeld, Mr. Yorke and Baron Henry de Worms.

Digitized by Google

The bill was introduced on November 19, 1884, and its opponents took the unprecedented course of challenging a division at this stage. Leave was however given to bring it in, and the second reading was set down for November 25, and then for December 9; on each occasion it was postponed owing to the adjournment of the House. It was next set down for Wednesday, March 4, but its chance was again destroyed by the appropriation by the government of all Wednesdays for the Seats bill. Mr. Woodall then fixed on June 24, but before that time the ministerial crisis occurred, and when that day arrived the House had been adjourned for the reëlections consequent upon a change of government. He then obtained the first place on Wednesday, July 22, but again ministers appropriated Wednesdays, and all chances for the session being over, Mr. Woodall gave order to discharge the bill.

This delay stands in sharp and painful contrast with the promptness with which parliament passed the Medical Relief bill. A clause had been inserted in the Franchise bill disfranchising any man who had been in receipt of parish medical aid for himself or family. This clause caused great dissatisfaction as it was stated it would disqualify from voting a large number of laborers in the agricultural counties; parliament therefore found time amidst all the press of business and party divisions to pass the Medical Relief bill removing this disfranchisement from *men*, though we are repeatedly assured that nothing but the want of time prevents their fair consideration of the enfranchisement of *women*. It is another proof that there is always time for a representative government to attend to the wants of its constituents.

Another effort was made in the House of Lords by Lord Denman who introduced a bill for extending the parliamentary vote to women. The committees * were unaware of his intention until

* *Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage*—Mrs. Ashford (Birmingham), Miss Lydia E. Becker (Manchester), Alfred W. Bennett, esq., M. A., Miss Caroline Ashurst Biggs, Miss Helen Blackburn, Miss Jessie Boucherett, Hon. Emmeline Canning, Miss Frances Power Cobbe, Miss Jane Cobden, Miss Courtenay, Leonard Courteny, esq., M. P., Mrs. Cowen (Nottingham), Miss Mabel Sharman Crawford, Mrs. Ashton Dilke, Hon. Mrs. Maurice Drummond (Hampstead), Mrs. Millicent G. Fawcett, Miss Agnes Garrett, Rev. C. Green (Bromley), Mrs. Ashworth Hallett (Bristol), Viscountess Harberton, Thomas Hare, esq., Mrs. Ann Maria Haslam (Dublin), Frederick Hill, esq., Mrs. John Hollond, Mrs. Frank Morrison, C. H. Hopwood, esq., Q. C., M. P., Mrs. John Hullah, Coleridge Kennard, esq., M. P., Mrs. Margaret Bright Lucas, Mrs. E. M. Lynch, Robert Main, esq., Mrs. Laura Pochin McLaren, Mrs. Eva Müller McLaren (Bradford), Mrs. Priscilla Bright McLaren (Edinburgh), Miss Henrietta Müller, Frederick Pennington, esq., M. P., Mrs. F. Pennington, Miss Reeves, Mrs. Saville, Miss Lillie Stacpole, Rev. S. A. Steinthal (Manchester), J. S. Symon, esq., Miss Helen Taylor, Sir Richard Temple, G. C. S. I.; J. P. Thomasson, esq., M. P., Mrs. Katherine Lucas Thomasson (Bolton), Miss Isabella M. Tod (Belfast), Miss Williams, William

Digitized by Google

they read a notice of the bill in the newspapers. The enacting clause was as follows:

All women, not legally disqualified, who have the same qualifications as the present and future electors for counties and divisions of counties and boroughs, shall be entitled to vote for knights of the shire for counties and divisions of counties and for boroughs, at every election.

A division was taken upon it on June 23, just after the Seats bill had been passed and the peers were about to adjourn in con sequence of the change of government. Many protests were made that the time was ill chosen, and some peers left the House to avoid recording their votes while others voted against it without reference to its merits as a question. The division showed 8 in favor and 36 against. There appears to be a strong impression that if a bill to enfranchise women were passed by the Commons it would be accepted by the Lords, while there is at the same time a feeling that any measure dealing with the representation of the people should originate with the Commons, and not in the upper House.

During the year 1885 we sustained the loss of many of the earliest friends of the movement; chief among these Professor Fawcett, who from the commencement of its history had given it his firm and unflinching support. His conviction that justice and freedom must gain the upper hand often caused him to take a more sanguine view of the prospect than the event has justified. He was the firm friend of women in all their recent efforts, and helped them to obtain employment in the civil service, to enter the medical profession, to open the universities, and in many other ways. Next to be mentioned is the death of Mrs. Stansfeld. She was the daughter of Mr. William H. Ashurst, who was a staunch advocate of freedom and may be remembered as the first English friend of William L. Garrison. She had been a member of the suffrage committee in London for more than sixteen years, and gave unfailing sympathy to all the efforts made by her noble husband, James Stansfeld, in behalf of the rights of humanity. This year has also been saddened by the death of Mrs. Ronald Shearer, formerly Helena Downing, an able and true-hearted woman, who had devoted her strength and talents to the furtherance of our cause at a time when its advocates were still the objects of ridicule and attack.

Woodall, esq. M. P. *Secretary*, Miss Florence Balgarnie. *Assistant Secretary*, Miss Torrance. *Organizing Agent*, Miss Moore. *Treasurer*, Mrs. Laura Pochin McLaren. *Office*, 29 Parliament street, London S. W.

Digitized by Google

The electorate of three millions of men is now increased to five millions, and by this extension of the suffrage the difficulty of waging an up-hill fight in the interests of the still excluded class has also been increased. The interests of the newly represented classes will imperatively claim precedence in the new parliament. Like the emancipated blacks who received the vote after the American civil war, while the women who had supported the cause of the Union by their enthusiasm and their sacrifices were passed over, the miners and laborers of English counties have received the franchise for which they have never asked, in preference to the women who have worked, petitioned and organized themselves for years to secure it. Women have now to appeal to this new electorate to grant that justice which the old electorate has denied them; they have to begin again the weary round of educating their new masters by appeals and arguments; they will once more see their interests "unavoidably" deferred to the interests of the represented classes; they will once again be bidden to stand aside till it is time for another Reform bill to be considered!

In recounting the history of woman suffrage frequent allusion has been made to the parallel movements which have been carried on through the same course of years; the most important of these have been: (1) The admission of women to fields of public usefulness; (2) removal of legal disabilities and hardships; (3) admission to a better education and greater freedom of employment. Much of the progress that has been made has been the work of the active friends of woman suffrage, and under the fostering care of the suffrage societies.

Under the first division comes the work of women on the school-boards. The education act of 1870 expressly guaranteed their right of being elected, and even in the first year several were elected. One, Miss Becker, in Manchester, has retained her seat ever since. In London the number of lady members has greatly varied. Beginning with two, Miss Jarrett and Miss Davis, in 1879 it rose to nine, but now, 1885, has sunk again to three, Miss Davenport Hill, Mrs. Westlake, and Mrs. Webster. Taken as a whole, their influence has been very usefully exerted for the benefit of the children and the young teachers. Under this head also comes women's work as poor-law guardians. The first was elected in Kensington in 1875. Six years afterwards a small society to promote the election of women was founded by Miss Müller,

Digitized by Google

and the number elected is steadily increasing. There are now in England and Scotland in all forty-six. In Ireland women are still debarred from this useful work. The election occurs every year, and it is one of the local franchises that women as well as men exercise. Last year three ladies were appointed members of the Metropolitan Board which looks after London hospitals and asylums. In 1873 Mr. Stansford, then president of the local government board, appointed Mrs. Hassan Session assistant inspector of work-houses, and after an interval of twelve years Miss Mason was appointed to the same position. Women are also sometimes appointed as church wardens, overseers of the roads, and registrars of births and deaths. These are the only public offices they fill.

Under the second heading, the removal of legal disabilities, is included the Married Woman's Property act, which was finally passed in 1882, twenty-five years after it had been first brought forward in parliament by Sir Erskine Perry. The ancient law of England transferred all property held by a woman, except land, absolutely to her husband. A step was gained in 1870 by which the money she had actually earned became her own. This was followed by frequent amendments, sometimes in Scotland, sometimes in England, and a comprehensive bill met with frequent vicissitudes, now in the House of Lords, now in the Commons. The honor of this long contest is chiefly due to Mrs. Jacob Bright and Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy, whose unwearied efforts were finally crowned with success by the act of 1882, under which the property of a married woman is absolutely secured to her as if she were single, and the power to contract and of sueing and being sued, also secured to her. The right to the custody of their own children is another point for which women are struggling. In 1884, Mr. Bryce, M. P., brought in a bill to render a mother the legal guardian of her children after the father's death. This was read a second time by a vote of 207 for, and only 73 against. In 1885, however, though passing the House of Lords, it was postponed till too late in the Commons. Another important alteration in the legal condition of married women was made in 1878. In that year Mr. Herschell introduced the Matrimonial Causes act to remedy a gross injustice in the divorce law, and Lord Pensance inserted a clause which provided that if a woman were brutally ill-treated by her husband, a magistrate might order a separate maintenance for her and assign her the

Digitized by Google

care of her children. It is no secret that the original drafting of this clause was due to Miss Frances Power Cobbe. The long struggle which is not yet terminated against the infamous Contagious Diseases acts belongs to this division of work. The acts were passed in 1866, '69, and for many years were supported by an overpowering majority of the House of Commons. Mr. Stansfeld, who has always been the supporter of every movement advancing the influence of women, has been the leader of this agitation. Mrs. Josephine Butler, Mrs. Stewart of Ougar, and latterly Mrs. Ormiston Chant, have been the most untiring speakers on this question. On April 26, 1883, Mr. Stansfeld carried a resolution by a vote of 184 against 112 for the abolition of the acts, since which time the acts have been suspended, but we must look to the new parliament for their total repeal. The Criminal-law Amendment act was the great triumph of 1885. It had been postponed session after session, but the bold denunciation of Mr. Stead, editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, finally roused the national conscience, and now a larger measure of protection is afforded to young girls than has ever been known before.

Of the successive steps by which colleges have been founded for women, and the universities opened to them, it is impossible to give any record. The London University and the Royal University of Ireland, recognize fully the equality of women; nine ladies secured the B. A. diploma from the latter university in 1884, and nine more in 1885. Oxford and Cambridge extend their examinations to women. The Victoria University acknowledges their claim to examination. The London school of medicine gives a first rate education to women (there are 48 this session), and the Royal College of Surgeons, Dublin, admits them to its classes. There are now about 45 ladies who are registered as medical practitioners. One of them, Miss Edith Stone, was appointed by Mr. Fawcett medical superintendent of the female staff at the general post-office, London. The success of the movement for supplying women as physicians for the vast Indian empire has attained remarkable success during the last two years.

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LVII.

CONTINENTAL EUROPE.*

BY THEODORE STANTON.

If you would know the political and moral status of a people, demand what place its women occupy.—[L. AIMÉ MARTIN.

There is nothing, I think, which marks more decidedly the character of men or of nations, than the manner in which they treat women.—[HERDER.

The Woman Question in the Back-ground—In France the Agitation Dates from the Upheaval of 1789—International Women's Rights Convention in Paris, 1878—Mlle. Hubertine Auclert Leads the Demand for Suffrage—Agitation began in Italy with the Kingdom—Concepcion Arenal in Spain—Coëducation in Portugal—Germany: Leipsic and Berlin—Austria in Advance of Germany—Caroline Svetlá of Bohemia—Austria Unsurpassed in contradictions—Marriage Emancipates from Tutelage in Hungary—Dr. Henrietta Jacobs of Holland—Dr Isala van Diest of Belgium—In Switzerland the Catholic Cantons Lag Behind—Marie Gœgg, the Leader—Sweden Stands First—Universities Open to Women in Norway—Associations in Denmark—Liberality of Russia toward Women—Poland—The Orient—Turkey—Jewish Wives—The Greek Woman in Turkey—The Greek Woman in Greece—An Unique Episode—Woman's Rights in the American Sense not known.

THE reader of the preceding pages will be sorely disappointed if he expects to find in this brief chapter a similar record of progress and reform. If, however, he looks simply for an earnest of the future, for a humble beginning of that wonderful revolution in favor of women which has occurred in the United States, and to a less degree in England, during the past quarter of a century, his expectations will be fully realized. More than this; he will close this long account of woman's emancipation in the new world convinced that in due season a similar blessing is to be enjoyed by the women of the old world.

For the moment, the woman question in Europe is pushed into the background by the all-absorbing struggle still going on in various forms between the republican and monarchical principle, between the vital present and the moribund past; but the most

* This chapter is, in large part, a résumé of Mr. Stanton's valuable work "The Woman Question in Europe," published in 1884 by the Putnams of New York, to which we refer the reader who desires to study more in detail the European movement for women.—[THE EDITORS.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

[illegible] [illegible]

G Sand

Digitized by Google

superficial observer must perceive, that the amelioration of the lamentable situation of European womanhood is sure to be one of the first problems to come to the front for resolution, as soon as liberty gains undisputed control on this continent,—a victory assured in the not-distant future. When men shall have secured their rights, the battle will be half won; women's rights will follow as a natural sequence.

The most logical beginning for a sketch of the woman movement on the continent, and indeed of any step in advance, is of course France, where ideas, not facts, stand out the more prominently; for, in questions of reform, the abstract must always precede the concrete,—public opinion must be convinced before it will accept an innovation. This has been the *rôle* of France in Europe ever since the great revolution; it is her *rôle* to-day. She is the agitator of the old world, and agitation is the lever of reform.

The woman movement in France dates from the upheaval of 1789. Though the demands for the rights of man threw all other claims into the shade, a few women did not fail to perceive that they also had interests at stake. Marie Olympe de Gouges, for example, in her "Declaration of the Rights of Woman," vindicated for her sex all the liberties proclaimed in the famous "Declaration of the Rights of Man." During the empire and the restoration the reform slept; under the July monarchy there was an occasional murmur, which burst forth into a vigorous protest when the revolution of 1848 awakened the aspirations of 1789, and George Sand consecrated her talent to the cause of progress. During the second empire, in spite of the oppressive nature of the government, the movement took on a more definite form; its advocates became more numerous; and men and women who held high places in literature, politics and journalism, spoke out plainly in favor of ameliorating the condition of French women. Then came the third republic, with more freedom than France had enjoyed since the beginning of the century. The woman movement felt the change, and, during the past ten years, its friends have been more active than ever before.

The most tangible event in the history of the question in France is the International Woman's Rights Congress, the first international gathering of the kind, which assembled in Paris in the months of July and August during the exposition season of 1878. The committee which called the congress contained representatives from six different countries, viz.: France, Switzerland,

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

G Sand

Digitized by Google

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

Digitized by Google

Italy, Holland, Russia and America. Among the eighteen members from France were two senators, five deputies and three Paris municipal councilors. Italy was represented by a deputy and the Countess of Travers, an indefatigable friend of the undertaking, who died just before the opening of the congress. The American members of the committee were Julia Ward Howe, Mary A. Livermore and Theodore Stanton. Among the members * of the congress, besides those just mentioned, were deputies, senators, publicists, journalists, and men and women of letters from all parts of Europe. Sixteen different organizations in Europe and America sent delegates. The National Woman Suffrage Association was represented by Jane Graham Jones and Theodore Stanton, and the American Woman Suffrage Association by Julia Ward Howe.

The work of the congress was divided into five sections, as follows: the historical, the educational, the economic, the moral, and the legislative. The congress was opened on July 25, by Léon Richer, its promoter and originator, and one of the most indefatigable friends of women's rights in France. He invited Maria Deraismes, an able speaker well known among Paris reformers, to act as temporary chairman. The next thing in order was the election of two permanent presidents, a man and a woman. The late M. Antide Martin, then an influential member of the Paris municipal council, and Julia Ward Howe were chosen. Mrs. Howe, on taking the chair, made a short speech which was very well received; Anna Maria Mozzoni, of Milan, a most eloquent orator, followed; and then Genevieve Graham Jones advanced to the platform, and in the name of her mother, Jane Graham Jones, delegate of the National Woman Suffrage Association, she conveyed to the congress messages of good-will from the United States. This address, delivered with much feeling, and appealing to French patriotism, was enthusiastically received. When Miss Jones had taken her seat, M. Martin arose, thanked the foreign ladies for their admirable words, and concluded in these terms: "In the name of my compatriots, I particularly return gratitude to Miss Graham Jones for the eloquent and cordial manner in which she has just

* The United States was represented by Albert Brisbane and Mrs. Brisbane, of New York; Elizabeth Chalmers and Mrs. Gibbons, of Philadelphia; Colonel T. W. Higginson, of Massachusetts; Miss Hotchkiss, Fernando Jones and his wife and daughter, Jane Graham Jones and Genevieve Graham Jones (now Mrs. Geo. R. Grant), Mrs. Klumpke and her two daughters, of Chicago; Mrs. Party and Louisa Southworth, of Ohio.

Digitized by Google

referred to France, and in turn, I salute republican America, which so often offers Europe examples of good sense, wisdom and liberty."

At the second session was read a long and eloquent letter from Salvatore Morelli,* the Italian deputy. Theodore Stanton read a paper entitled, "The Woman Movement in the United States." The third session was devoted to the educational phase of the woman question. Tony Révillon, who has since become one of the radical deputies of Paris, spoke, and Miss Hotchkiss presented an able report on "The Education of Women in America." After Miss Hotchkiss had finished, Auguste Desmoulins, now a member of the Paris municipal council, offered, as president of the section, a resolution advocating the principal reforms—the same studies for boys and girls, and coëducation—demanded by Miss Hotchkiss. The resolution was carried without debate. Aurelia Cimino Folliero de Luna, of Florence, followed in a few remarks on the "Mission of Woman." Eugénie Pierre, of Paris, spoke on the "Vices of Education in Different Classes of Society," and in closing complimented America in the highest terms for its progressive position on the woman question. In fact, the example of the United States was frequently cited throughout the proceedings of this congress, and the reformers of America may find some joy in feeling that their labors are producing fruit even in the old world.

At the last session of the congress, August 9, 1878, a permanent international committee was announced. France, England, Italy, Alsace-Lorraine, Switzerland, Germany, Holland, Sweden, Poland, Russia, Roumania and the United States are all represented on this committee.† The chief duties of this committee were to be

* Before closing this brief sketch, I desire to mention with deep gratitude the name of the man who first lifted up his voice in the Italian parliament to defend and protect women. Salvatore Morelli deserves the veneration of every Italian woman. His first book, "Woman and Science" (*La Donna e la Scienza*), dedicated to Antona Traversi, was animated by a just and noble spirit, too radical, however, to meet with universal approbation. When he entered parliament, Morelli, with the same courage, constancy, and radicalism, demanded the complete emancipation of women. Conservatives laughed, and many friends of our movement trembled for the cause. Ably seconded by Mancini, he succeeded in securing for women the right to testify in civil actions, a dignity which they had not previously enjoyed, although, by an absurd contradiction they could be witnesses in criminal cases, convict of murder by a single word and send the criminal to the scaffold. One of Morelli's last acts was a divorce bill which was examined by the Chamber. Guardasigilli Tomman Villa, the then Minister of Justice, was inclined to accept it, but death, which occurred in 1880, saved poor Morelli the pain of seeing his proposition rejected. An appeal to women has been made to raise a modest monument to Salvatore Morelli in memory of his good deeds, by Aurelia Cimino Folliero de Luna. The author of this essay has been requested to receive subscriptions to this fund. Such subscriptions will be acknowledged and forwarded to the Italian Committee. They should be addressed to Theodore Stanton, 9 rue de Bassano, Paris, France.

† The American members are as follows: Massachusetts, Julia Ward Howe, Lucy Stone; Illinois, Jane Graham Jones, Miss Hotchkiss; New York, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Theodore Stanton; Pennsylvania, Mrs. Gibbons, of Philadelphia.

Digitized by Google

the advancement of the reforms demanded by the congress and to issue the call for the next international gathering. The congress ended with a grand banquet on the evening of the last day's session, in which about two hundred guests participated.

The present situation in France is full of interest and encouragement. There are societies, journals, and different groups of reformers all striving independently but earnestly to better the situation of French women politically, civilly, morally and intellectually. At the head of the agitation in favor of women's political rights stand Hubertine Auclert and her vigorous monthly, *La Citoyenne**; the reformers of the code are lead by Léon Richer and his outspoken monthly, *Le Droit des Femmes*†; the movement in favor of divorce, which was crowned with success in the summer of 1884, is headed by Alfred Naquet in the senate, and finds one of its earliest and ablest supporters in Olympe Audouard; the emancipation of women from priestly domination—and herein lies the greatest and most dangerous obstacle that the reformers encounter—counts among its many advocates Maria Deraismes; woman's moral improvement, to be mainly accomplished by the abolition of legalized prostitution, is demanded by Dr. and Mrs. Chapman and Emilie de Morsier; while the great uprising in favor of woman's education has such a host of friends and has already produced such grand results, that the brief limits of this sketch will permit neither an enumeration of the one nor the other.

The transition from France to Italy is easy and natural, for it is on the Cisalpine peninsula that Gallic ideas have always taken deeper root than elsewhere on the Continent, and, as might be expected, the Italian woman movement resembles in many respects that of which we have just spoken.

With the formation of the kingdom of Italy in 1870 began a well-defined agitation in favor of Italian women. The educational question was first taken up. Prominent among the women who participated in this movement were Laura Mantegazza, the Marchioness Brigida Tanari, and Alessandrina Ravizza. Aurelia Cimino Folliero de Luna, who has devoted her whole life to improving the condition of her countrywomen, writes me from Florence on this subject. "Here it was," she says, "that the example of American and English women, who in this re-

* The office of this journal is 12, rue de Cail, Paris.

† The office of this journal is 4, rue des Deux-Gares, Paris.

Digitized by Google

spect were our superiors, was useful to us. While we were still under foreign domination and ignorant of solidarity of sex, they were free and united." The new political life produced a number of able women orators and writers, such as Anna Mozzoni, Malvina Frank, Gualberta Beccari, and many others. The last named founded at Venice *La Donna*, and in 1872 Aurelia Cimino Folliero de Luna established in Florence *La Cornelia*, which has since ceased to exist, while in 1882 Ernesta Napollon began at Naples the publication of the short-lived *L'Umanitario*, the youngest of a goodly list of journals which have done much to excite an interest in the woman question. The Italian government has generously seconded the efforts of the reformers. The code has been modified, schools have been established, the universities thrown open and courses in agriculture proposed.

But the most significant sign of progress in Italy was afforded by the great universal suffrage convention, held at Rome on February 11, 12, 1881. Anna Mozzoni, delegate to the convention from the Milan Society for the Promotion of Woman's Interests, of which she is the able president, made an eloquent appeal for woman suffrage and introduced a resolution to this effect which was carried by a good majority.* In 1876 a committee of the Chamber, of which the deputy Peruzzi was chairman, reported a bill in favor of conferring on women the right to vote on municipal and provincial questions (*voto amministrativo*), a privilege which they had formerly enjoyed in Lombardy and Venice under Austrian rule. This bill was reïntroduced in 1882 by the Depretis ministry and was reported upon favorably by the proper committee in June, 1884. It is believed that the proposition will soon become a law. If such is the case, Italian women will enjoy the same rights as Italian men in municipal and provincial affairs, with this exception, that they will not be eligible to office in the bodies of which they are electors.† Aurelia Cimino Folliero de Luna, says:

I make no doubt that in a few years the question of the emancipation of women in Italy will be better understood; will be regarded from a more elevated standpoint and will receive a more general and greater support; for if we turn to the past, we shall be astonished at what has already been accomplished in this direction.

* See the *Index*, of Boston, May 19, 1881, where I give in full this remarkable speech.

† What is said of Austria in this respect further on in this chapter will apply to Italy if the proposed reform is finally accepted by parliament.

Digitized by Google

Concepcion Arenal, the distinguished Spanish authoress, signals several signs of progress in her country. This lady writes:

In the schools founded by the Madrid Association for the Education of Women, nearly five hundred girls pursue courses in pedagogics, commercial studies, modern languages, painting, etc. This instruction, for the most part gratis, is given by professors who devote their time and strength to this noble object without receiving any remuneration,—worthy continuators of the grand work of the founder of the Madrid high-school for women, Fernando de Castro, of blessed memory, one of the most philanthropic men I ever met, who so loved mankind that his name should be known in every land. Nine hundred and eighteen girls attended the session of 1880–1881 of the school of music and declamation at Madrid, and the number has since increased.

A few years ago a school of arts and trades was founded at the capital, and women were admitted to the classes in drawing. In 1881, one hundred and thirty availed themselves of this privilege. In 1882, one hundred and fifty-four female students were present at the institutions (*institutos*) for intermediate education in Spain. The coëducation of the sexes, therefore, is not unknown to us. In that year Valencia, Barcelona, Gerona and Seville each counted sixteen, while the single girl at Mahon discontinued her studies on the ground that she preferred not to mingle with boys. At Malaga, the only female aspirant for the bachelor's degree took seven prizes, and was "excellent" in all her studies. During the academic year, 1881–1882, twelve women attended lectures in the Spanish universities. The three at Madrid were all working for the doctorate, and one had passed the necessary examinations; the two at Valladolid were occupied with medicine, while at Barcelona five were studying medicine, one law, and one pharmacy. Three of the medical students have passed their examinations, but instead of the degrees, which are refused them, they are granted certificates which do not allow them to practice.

Our public opinion is progressing, as is evidenced by the laws, and especially by the educational reforms, which are the exclusive work of men. The council of public instruction, a consulting body holding by no means advanced ideas, was called upon a short time ago, to decide whether the university certificates conferred upon women could be converted into regular degrees, which would entitle the recipients to the enjoyment of the privileges attached to these titles. The learned council discussed, hesitated, tried to decide the question, but finally left it in a situation which was neither clear nor conclusive. This hesitancy and vagueness are very significant; a few years ago a negative decision would have been given promptly and in the plainest terms.

Portugal is following closely upon the steps of Spain, and, in the former as in the latter country, it is in the department of education that the most marked signs of an awakening are to be found. Rodrigues de Freitas, the well-known publicist and republican statesman of Porto, says:

Digitized by Google

There is not a single intermediate school for girls in all Portugal. In 1883, the Portugese parliament took up the subject of intermediate instruction, and discussed the question in its relation to women, and the progress in this direction realized in France during the last few years. A deputy who opposed the reform, recalled the words of Jules Simon, pronounced in a recent sitting of the council of public instruction at Paris. The philosopher remarked:

We are here a few old men, very fortunate gentlemen, in being excused from having to marry the girls you propose to bring up.

Our minister of the interior, who has charge of public instruction, followed, and declared that he was in favor of the establishment of girls' colleges. He said:

It is true that M. Jules Simon considers himself fortunate in not having to marry a girl educated in a French college; but I think I have discovered the reason for this aversion. He is getting in his dotage, otherwise he would experience no repugnance in proposing to such a girl, provided, of course, that, along with an education, she was at the same time pretty and virtuous.

The chamber laughed. And such is the situation to-day: the minister favorable to the better instruction of women, while neither minister nor deputies make an earnest effort to bring it about.

This dark picture is relieved, however, by one or two bright touches. There are many private boarding schools where families in easy circumstances send their daughters, who learn to speak several languages, are taught a little elementary mathematics and geography, and acquire a few accomplishments. Some of the pupils of these institutions pass with credit the examinations of the boys' lyceums or colleges. Article 72, of the law of June 14, 1880, on intermediate instruction, reads as follows: "Students of the female sex, who wish to enter the State schools, or pass the examinations of said schools, come within the provisions of this law, except as regards the regulations concerning boarding scholars." That is to say, girls enjoy in the State intermediate schools the same privileges as male day scholars. Many girls have availed themselves of this opportunity and have passed the lyceum examinations.

Crossing the Rhine into the Teutonic countries, we find less progress on the whole, than among the Latin races. Germany, however, if behind France and Italy, is far ahead of Spain and Portugal. The agitation is divided into two currents: the Leipsic and the Berlin movements. The former is the older, the General Association of German Women having been founded in Leipsic in October, 1865. Louise Otto-Peters, the prime mover in the organization of this association, may be considered the originator of the German movement. A novelist of much power, whose stories all teach a lesson in socialism, she established in 1848, the year of the great revolutionary fermentation throughout Europe, the first paper which advocated the interests of women in Germany. The aims of the Leipsic and Berlin re-

Digitized by Google

formers were of an economic and educational nature. It was felt that the time had come when woman must have wider and better paid fields of work, and when she must be more thoroughly educated in order to be able the easier to gain her livelihood. A paper, *New Paths* (*Neue Bahnen*), was established as the organ of the association. It still exists. The plan of holding annual conventions—much like those which have been in progress in America for so many years—in the chief cities of Germany was settled upon, and numerous meetings of this kind have already occurred. At these gatherings all questions pertaining to woman's advancement are discussed, and auxiliary associations organized. The General Association of German Women has sent several petitions to the Reichstag, or imperial parliament, demanding various reforms and innovations. The principal members of the association are Louise Otto-Peters, the president and editor of the *Neue Bahnen;* Henriette Goldschmidt, the most effective speaker of the group; and Mrs. Winter, the treasurer, all of whom live in Leipsic; Miss Menzzer of Dresden; Lina Morgenstern, the well-known Berlin philanthropist; and Marie Calm of Cassel, perhaps the most radical of the body, whose ideas on woman suffrage are much the same as those entertained in England and the United States. In fact, an American is frequently struck by the similarity between many of the features of the General Association of German Women, and the Woman's Rights Association in the United States.

The Berlin movement, which resembles that of Leipsic in everything except that it is rather more conservative, owes its origin to that distinguished philanthropist, Dr. Adolf Lette. The Lette Verein, or Lette Society, so called in honor of its founder, was organized in December, 1865, but a few months after the establishment of the Leipsic association. The object of the society is, as has already been said, to improve the material condition of women, especially poor women, by giving them a better education, by teaching them manual employments, by helping to establish them in business—in a word, by affording them the means to support themselves. The Lette Society has become the nucleus of similar organizations scattered all over the German empire. Its organ, the *German Woman's Advocate* (*Deutcher Frauenanwalt*), is a well-conducted little monthly, edited by the secretary of the society, Jenny Hirsch. Anna Schepeler-Lette, daughter of the founder, has been for many

Digitized by Google

years and is still at the head of this admirable society. She writes me:

If we are asked whether we would have women enter public life, whether we would wish them to become professors in the university, clergymen in the church, and lawyers at the bar, as is the case in America, we should make no response, for they are but idle questions. These demands have not yet been made in Germany, nor will they be made for a long time to come, if ever. But why peer into the future? We have today many institutions, many customs, which past centuries would have looked upon as contrary to Divine and human law. In this connection we would say with Sancho Panza: "What is, is able to be."

The German philosopher, Herr von Kirchmann, is more decided in his views concerning the future of his countrywomen. In one of his last works, entitled "Questions and Dangers of the Hour" (*Zeitfragen und Abenteuer*) is a chapter on "Women in the Past and Future," where it is shown that the female sex has been gradually gaining its freedom, and the prediction is made that the day is near at hand when women will obtain their complete independence and will compete with men in every department of life, not excepting politics.

Turning to the other great Germanic nation, Austria, we find still less progress than in the north. In fact, the movement in the south is little more than a question of woman's self-support. The important problem of woman's education is not yet resolved in Germany, and in Austria still less has been done. "In two particulars," writes a Berlin correspondent, "Austria may be said to be in advance of Germany. The admission of women to the university does not present such insurmountable difficulties, and her employment in railroad, post, and telegraph offices does not encounter such strong opposition." But it must not be supposed from this statement that the Austrian universities are open to women. "Our universities are shut against women," Professor Wendt, of Troppau, informs me; "but they may pass the same examinations as boys who have finished their preparatory studies, though it is distinctly stated in the women's diplomas that they may not continue their studies in the university." The professors, however, sometimes allow foreign girls to attend lectures. Professor Bruhl, of Vienna, for example, has lectured to men and women on anatomy. The Academy of Fine Arts at Vienna is not open to women, though the Conservatory of Music is much frequented by them. In 1880, in fact, three women re-

Digitized by Google

ceived prizes for musical compositions. Johanna Leitenberger, of Salzburg, writes:

Several newspapers are devoted to the different phases of the woman's movement in Austria. Some years ago an ex-officer, Captain A. D. Korn, who, if I am not mistaken, had passed some time in England and America, founded the *Women's Universal Journal* (*Allgemeine Frauen Zeitung*). This newspaper was wholly devoted to women's interest, but it soon died. The same thing is true of the *Women's Journal* (*Frauenblätter*) of Gratz, which appeared for a short time under my editorship. * * * *
On October 9, 10, 11, 1872, the third German women's convention (*Deutsche Frauenkonferenz*) was held at Vienna, under the auspices of the general society for popular education and the amelioration of women's condition. The other two sittings of this society had been held at Leipsic and Stuttgart. The soul of this new movement was Captain Korn, whom I have already mentioned. His study of the woman question in the United States may have prompted him to awaken a similar agitation among the women of the Austrian empire. Addresses were delivered at this convention by ladies from Vienna, Hungary, Bohemia and Styria, and all the various interests of women were discussed. * * * *
The proceedings of the convention attracted considerable attention, and produced favorable impressions on the audience, which was recruited from the better classes of the population. But the newspapers of Vienna ridiculed the young movement, its friends grew lukewarm, and every trace was soon lost of this first and last Austrian women's rights convention.

In one important particular the Austro-Hungarian empire treats women more fairly than is the case in other European countries. Elise Krásnohorská, the Bohemian author, writes me:

Women have a voice in the municipal, provincial and national elections, though male citizens duly authorized by them cast their vote. With this single reserve—a very important one, it must be confessed—our women are politically the equals of men. At Prague, however, this is not the case. The Bohemian capital preserves an ancient privilege which is in contradiction to the Austrian electoral law, and which excludes us from the elective franchise. Universal suffrage does not exist in the empire, but the payment of a certain amount of taxes confers the right to vote. I do not enter into the details of the electoral law, which is somewhat complicated, which has its exceptions and contradictions, and is in fact an apple of discord in Austria in more than one respect; but, speaking generally, it may be said that a woman who owns property, who is in business, or who pays taxes, may designate a citizen possessing her confidence to represent her at the polls. Our women are satisfied with this system, and prefer it to casting their ballot in person.

It may be said, also, that women are eligible to office, or at least that there is no law against their accepting it, while there are instances of

Digitized by Google

their having done so. In southern Bohemia, a short time ago, a countess was chosen member of a provincial assembly (*okresni zastupitestvo*) with the approval of the body, on the condition that she should not participate personally in its deliberations, but should be represented by a man having full power to act for her. At Agram in Croatia, a woman was elected, a few years ago, member of the municipal council, and no objection was made. Of course such cases are very rare, but they have their significance.

Carolina Svetlá, the distinguished poet and author, has done, perhaps, the most to awaken thought on the woman question in Bohemia. She stands at the head of a talented group of literary women, which plays a brilliant part in the fatherland of Huss. The means for woman's instruction, however, are most lamentable in Bohemia. The universities are shut against women, and though two women have been graduated in Switzerland, their degrees are not recognized in their native land. Beyond primary instruction the State does almost nothing for its women, though they outnumber the other sex by two hundred thousand. In several of the large cities of Bohemia something has been accomplished for girls' high-school and normal-school instruction; but, in general, we may say that the intellectual development of Bohemian girls is left to private instruction. Associations of women have done much to fill this void, one of which, founded by Carolina Svetlá, is devoted to the industrial and commercial instruction of girls. Two thousand women belong to this association, and five hundred girls attend its school annually, while many young women frequent its school for the training of nurses. This vigorous organization has disarmed prejudices by the success of its schools and by the arguments of its monthly organ, the *Zenské Listy*, ably edited by Elise Krásnohorská, one of the best known Bohemian poets, and a leader in the work of improving the condition of her countrywomen. Vojtá Náprstek, a man who has justly been named "the woman's advocate," has founded at Prague the Women's American Club, whose object is charity and the intellectual elevation of women, and has presented the club a valuable collection of books and objects of art. A lady, writing me from Prague, says:

The club has always been in a most flourishing condition, although it has never had a constitution or by-laws to hold it together,—nothing but the single bond of philanthropy. At first it had not even a name. But outsiders began to call its members 'the Americans,' because they adopted American improvements in their homes. The appellation was accepted

Digitized by Google

by the club as an honorable title, and from that time it formally called itself the "American Club."

The Austrian code, in its treatment of women, is unsurpassed in contradictions. Women, for example, may testify in criminal actions, but they may not be witnesses to the simplest legal document. There are many absurdities of this sort in the existing law which were unknown in the ancient code of independent Bohemia, which was more liberal in its treatment of women. Divorce exists, but divorced persons cannot marry again. Bohemia being a part of Austria, women vote in the same way as has already been mentioned in what was said of the latter country. But at Prague, however, women do not vote, the capital still retaining its old laws on this subject.

Concerning the other grand division of the empire of the Hapsburgs, Hungary, much the same may be said as of Bohemia. It is only within the last forty years that Hungary has striven to attain to the level of occidental civilization and culture, so that the question of the amelioration of women's condition is of very recent origin in that country. Rose Revai, of Budapest, writes:

Hungarian legislators have always treated us favorably in all matters pertaining to the family, marriage and inheritance. By the mere act of marriage we attain our majority and are emancipated from tutelage. As heirs, our interests are not forgotten, and as widows, we have the control over our own children. In business and trade we enjoy equal rights with men. And Hungarian women have not been slow to take advantage of these privileges, as is shown by those of our sex who occupy worthy positions in literature, art, commerce, industry, the theater and the school-room.

Although the Hungarian universities are still closed against women, there are many girls' industrial and normal schools and colleges. The impetus given to female education in Hungary is chiefly due to the late Baron Joseph Eœtvœs, the savant, poet and philanthropist, who was minister of public instruction in 1867. Women are employed in the postal and telegraphic service.

Returning north, to Holland, we find much the same situation as in the other Teutonic nations. "The women of Holland are unquestionably better educated, and entertain as a body more liberal ideas than French women," said a Dutch lady to me, who had lived many years at Paris; "but, on the other hand, there is not the little group of women in the Netherlands who grasp the real meaning of the woman question as is the case here in France." Woman's social position is a little better in Holland

Digitized by Google

than in the Catholic countries. In 1870 an essay on the woman question "by a lady" demanded political rights for women, and there are a few instances of women having lectured on that subject. The Dutch universities are open to female students, and Aletta Henriette Jacobs, the first and only female physician in Holland, has a successful practice at Amsterdam. Dr. Jacobs recently attempted to vote, and carried the question before the courts. Elise A. Haighton, of Amsterdam, writes:

A few of our women do not hesitate to participate in political and social discussions. The Union (*Unie*), a society which aims to promote popular interest in politics by meetings, debates, tracts, etc.; the Daybreak (*Dageraad*), a radical association which holds very ultra opinions on politics, religion and science, and supports a magazine to which many scientific men contribute; and the New Malthusian Band, an organization sufficiently explained by its name, all count several women among their members.

Elise van Calcar, the veteran Dutch authoress, sums up the situation in Holland, as follows:

I am sorry to have to confess that, as regards the general emancipation of women, we have accomplished but very little. Our work is indirect; we can only proclaim the injustice of our position.

Two countries, the product of Latin and Teutonic civilization, Belgium and Switzerland, must be touched upon before we turn to the Scandinavian people. Of the first, Belgium, about the same may be said as of Holland with which she was so long united politically. A correspondent in Belgium writes me as follows:

There cannot be said to be any movement in this country in favor of the emancipation of women. No journal, no association, no organization of any kind exists.

But public opinion is said to be quite favorable. Women are making their way slowly into certain callings. The professors of the universities of Liege and Ghent, when asked their opinion not long ago by the minister of public instruction, expressed a desire to see women admitted to the privileges of these institutions on the same terms as men, and to-day female students are found at all the institutions for higher education. Another correspondent writes:

Within the past few years an effort has been made among the women of the middle classes in the large cities, and secondary and professional schools have been established for girls, which are already producing good fruit. This movement is beginning to make itself felt among the upper classes, and it is to be hoped that the next generation will make

Digitized by Google

longer strides in the direction of instruction than is the case with the present generation.

In one respect at least Belgium is far behind her neighbor, Holland. Dr. Isala van Diest, the first and so far the only female physician in Belgium, although she has passed successfully all the necessary examinations and taken all the necessary degrees, may not practice medicine in her own country. She wrote me recently:

I fear I shall soon be obliged to give up the fight and go to France, England or Holland, unless I wish to lose the fruit of all my studies.

Concerning the higher education of women Dr. van Diest writes:

There existed in Belgium some years ago a law which required students who would enter the university, to pass the examination of graduate in letters (*gradué-en-lettres*). Candidates for this degree were expected to know how to translate Greek and write Latin. But as there were no schools where girls could study the dead languages with the thoroughness of boys who were trained six years in the classics, the former were almost entirely shut out from enjoying the advantages of an university course. This *graduat*, however, no longer exists, and the entrance of women into our universities is now possible. Female students are found to-day at Brussels, Liege and Ghent, but their number is still very small. It was in 1880 that the first woman entered the university of Brussels, but it was not until 1883 that their admission became general. They pursue, for the most part, scientific studies, thereby securing more lucrative positions as teachers, and pass their examinations for graduation with success.

Switzerland being made up of more than a score of separate cantons closely resembling our States in their political organization, it is difficult to arrive at the exact situation throughout the whole country—small though it be. However, generally speaking, it may be said that the Helvetic republic has remained almost a passive spectator of the woman movement, though a few signs of progress are worthy of note. The Catholic cantons lag behind those that have adopted Protestantism, and the latter are led by Geneva. Though subject to the Napoleonic code, Geneva has never known that debasing law of the tutelage of women which existed for so long a time in the other cantons, even in the intelligent canton of Vaud, where it was abolished only in 1873. It was not until 1881 that a federal statute put an end to the law throughout all Switzerland. Geneva has always been very liberal in its treatment of married women—divorce exists, excellent intermediate girls' schools were created more than thirty years ago, and women are admitted to all the

Digitized by Google

university lectures. Marie Gœgg, the untiring leader of the movement in that country, writes me:

However, notwithstanding these examples of liberality, which denote that the law-makers had a breadth of view in accord with their time, Switzerland, as a whole, has been one of the least disposed of European States to accept the idea of the civil emancipation of woman, much less her political emancipation, so that from 1848 to 1868 the demands of American women were considered here to be the height of extravagance. . . . . The seed planted in America in 1848, though its growth was difficult, finally began to take root in Europe. The hour had come.

In March, 1868, Marie Gœgg published a letter, in which she invited the women of all nations to join with her in the formation of a society. In July of that same year the Woman's International Association was founded at Geneva with Marie Gœgg as president. The organization began immediately an active work, and through its efforts, several of the reforms already mentioned were brought about, and public opinion in Switzerland considerably enlightened on the question. Mrs. Gœgg says:

With the object of advancing the young movement, I established at my own risk a bi-monthly, the *Woman's Journal* (*Journal des femmes*). But this was a violation of that good Latin motto, *festina lentè*, and, at the end of a few months the paper suspended publication. Swiss public opinion was not yet ready to support such a venture.

It may be pointed out here that, except in England, all the women's societies created in Europe had, up to the time of the organization of the International Association refrained from touching the question of the political rights of women. The Swiss association, on the contrary, always included this subject in its programme. But, unfortunately, at the moment when our efforts were meeting with success, and the future was full of promise for the cause which we advocated, the terrible Franco-German war broke out, and, for various reasons unnecessary to go into here, I felt constrained to resign the presidency, and the association came to an end.

Two years later the International Association was revived in the form of the Solidarity (*Solidarité*), whose name signified the spirit which ought to unite all women. In 1875 Mrs. Gœgg became president of the new organization as well as founder and editor of its organ, the *Solidarity Bulletin* (*Bulletin de la Solidarité*). But on September 20, 1880, both society and journal ceased to exist. The president in her farewell address said:

The dissolution of the Solidarity ought not to discourage us, but ought rather to cause us to rejoice, for the recent creation of so many women's national societies in different countries proves that the Solidarity has accomplished its aim, so that we have only to retire.

The striking success of university coëducation in Switzerland calls for a few words of notice. Mrs. Gœgg writes:

In October, 1872, I sent a petition to the grand-council of Geneva, asking that women be admitted to the university of Geneva on the same footing as men. The state of public opinion on this subject in Switzerland, and especially in Geneva, may be judged from the fact that, fearing to compromise the demand if I acted in my own name or that of the Solidarity, the petition was presented as coming from "the mothers of Geneva." Our prayer was granted.

The number of women who have pursued studies at Geneva has steadily increased every year. In 1878 the university of Nuefchatel was thrown open to women, while the university of Zurich has long had a large number of female students. Professor Pflüger, of the university of Bern, writing to me in April, 1883, said:

From February 2, 1876, to the present time, thirty-five women have taken degrees at our medical school. The lectures are attended each semister on an average by from twenty-five to thirty women, while from three to six follow the lectures on philosophy and letters. The presence of women at our university has occasioned no serious inconvenience and many colleagues favor it.

The rector of the university of Geneva wrote, February, 1883:

Up to the present time the attendance of women at our university has occasioned us no inconvenience except in some lectures of the medical school, where the subjects are not always of a nature to admit of their treatment before mixed classes.

We shall now glance at the situation of woman in the three Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Norway and Denmark. Sweden stands first, just as Germany does among the Teutonic nations, and France among the Latin nations; in fact we may perhaps go farther and say that of all Continental States, Sweden leads in many respects at least, in the revolution in favor of women.

The State, the royal family, private individuals, and, above all, women themselves have all striven to outstrip each other in the emancipation of Swedish women. Normal schools, high schools, primary schools, the Royal Academy of Music and the Royal Academy of Fine Arts, both at Stockholm, dairy schools and a host of other educational insitutions, both private and public, are thrown wide open to women. The State has founded scholarships for women at Upsala University and at the medical school of the university of Lund. Numerous benevolent, charitable and

Digitized by Google

industrial societies have been established and in many instances are managed by women. But the best idea may be gained of the liberal spirit which prevails in Sweden by showing what the State has done for the emancipation of women. For instance, in 1845, equality of inheritance for son and daughter was established, and the wife was given equal rights with the husband as regards the common property; in 1846, woman was permitted to practice industrial professions and to carry on business in her own name; in 1861, the professions of surgery and dentistry were opened to her; in 1864, her rights in trade and industrial pursuits were enlarged; in 1870, she was admitted to the universities and medical profession; in 1872, a woman of twenty-five was given the full right of disposing of herself in marriage, the consent of parents and relations having been necessary before that time; and in 1874, a married woman became entitled to control that part of her private property set aside for her personal use in the marriage contract, as well as to possess her own earnings. The reforms in favor of married women are in no small measure due to the society founded in 1871 by Mrs. E. Anckarsvärd and Anna Hierta Retzius, whose aim was the accomplishment of these very reforms.

A good beginning has been made toward securing full political rights for Swedish women. In many matters relative to the muncipality, women vote on the same terms with men, as for example, in the choice of the parish clergy, in the election of municipal councilors, and members of the county council. This latter body elects the House of Lords, so that woman's influence, through an intermediate electoral body, is felt in the upper chamber. May this not be one reason why the Swedish legislature has been so liberal toward women? Demands have been made, but in vain, for the complete franchise which would confer upon women the privilege of voting for members of the diet. Woman's interests have found a warm and energetic advocate in the *Home Review* (*Tidskrift för Hemmet*), which was founded in 1859 by the Hon. Rosalie d'Olivecrona and the Baroness Leyonhufoud, to-day the Hon. Mrs. Adlersparre. The paper is still edited by the latter; Rosalie d'Olivecrona, who has always been a most active friend of the woman movement, having retired in 1868.

If we cross the boundaries of Sweden into the sister kingdom of Norway, we find the condition of woman absolutely changed.

Digitized by Google

"Concerning Norway, I have said almost nothing," writes Camilla Collett, the distinguished Norwegian author, in some notes which she sent me recently on the situation of women in Scandinavia, "for the very simple reason that there is little to say." The long and oppressive domination of Denmark prostrated Norway, but her close union with Sweden since the fall of Napoleon, has begun to have a good effect, and the liberal influence of the latter country in favor of woman is already beginning to be felt in the other half of the Scandinavian peninsula. One step in advance has been the opening of the university to women—"The best thing that can be said of Norway," says Camilla Collett. Miss Cecilie Thoresen, the first female student to matriculate at Christiania University, writing to me from Eidsvold, Norway, in December, 1882, says it was in 1880 that she decided to try and take an academic degree. Her father, therefore, applied to the minister of public instruction for the necessary authorization; the latter referred the application to the university authorities, who, in their turn, submitted the portentous question to the faculty of the law-school. In due season Miss Thoresen received this rather unsatisfactory response:

> The admission of women to the university is denied, but we recognize the necessity for changing the law on the subject.

Thereupon Mr. H. E. Berner, the prominent liberal member of the Storthing, or Norwegian parliament, introduced a bill permitting women to pursue university studies leading to the degrees in arts and philosophy (*examen artium* and *examen philosophicum*). The committee reported unanimously in favor of the bill; on March 30, 1882, it passed without debate the Odelsthing, one of the two chambers of the Storthing, with but one dissenting voice—that of a clergyman; on April 21, 1882, it received the unanimous vote of the other house, the Lagthing; and it finally became a law on June 15, 1882. But Mr. Berner did not stop here. He once wrote me:

> In my opinion there hardly exists nowadays another social problem which has a better claim on public attention than that of the emancipation of women. Until they are placed on an equal footing with men, we shall not have departed from the days of barbarism.

In 1884, Mr. Berner succeeded in making it possible for women to take all university degrees, the law of 1882 having opened to them only the degrees in arts and philosophy. He is now press-

Digitized by Google

ing on the attention of parliament other reforms in favor of women; and he has recently written me that he believes that his efforts will be crowned with success.

In Denmark nothing has been done in the direction of political rights, nothing for school suffrage, though the liberal movement of 1848 improved woman's legal position slightly. But the situation of married women is still very unsatisfactory, for it may be summed up by saying that her property and her children are controlled by the husband. In 1879 many thousand women petitioned the legislature for the right to their own earnings, and a law was passed to this effect. During the last twenty years, thanks to the example set by Sweden, much has been done to open to women the field of work. In 1875 the university consented to receive women, but as the State furnishes them only primary instruction, and does nothing for their intermediate instruction, leaving this broad gap to be filled by private efforts, the educational situation of Danish women leaves much to be desired. But the women themselves have turned their attention to this matter, and high schools and professional schools for women, and generally managed by women, are springing up.

Denmark has produced several journals devoted to the interests of women and edited by women. The *Friday* (*Fredagen*), issued from July, 1875, to 1879, was edited by Vilhelmine Zahle. It was a bold, radical little sheet. The name was probably taken from the *Woman's Journal and Friday Society*, which appeared at Copenhagen in 1767, under the anonymous editorship of a woman. The *Woman's Review* (*Tidsskrift for Kvinder*) began to appear in January, 1882. Its editor, Elfride Fibiger, has associated with her Mr. Friïs, a very earnest friend of the women's movement, who has given a more progressive turn to the paper, which has come out for women's suffrage—the first journal in Denmark to take this radical step.

Perhaps the most encouraging sign of progress is the foundation, during the past few years, of numerous associations of women with different objects in view. John Stuart Mill's "Subjection of Women," which was translated into Danish and widely read; the "Letters from Clara Raphael," of Mathilde Fibiger, which appeared still earlier, in 1850; the writings of Camilla Collett, of Norway; the liberal utterances of the great poets of the North, Björnsen, Hostrup and Ibsen, whose "Nora" has

Digitized by Google

rightfully procured for him the title of "Woman's Poet"; the great progress in America, England and Sweden; all these influences stimulated thought, weakened prejudices and prepared the way for reforms in the Danish peninsula. Kirstine Frederiksen, of Copenhagen, says:

> It is plainly evident that Danish women are weary of the part allotted to them in the old society, a part characterized by the sentiment that the best that can be said of a woman is that there is nothing to say about her. . . . . When, in due time, the claim for political rights is made here in Denmark, then will women from all classes unite in their efforts to secure the palladium which alone can protect them from arbitrariness and subjection.

We shall now take up the Slavonic countries, beginning with Russia, which stands first, not only because of its vastness, but also because of its liberality toward women. The position of the Russian women before the law is very peculiar. Children, whatever their age and whether male or female, are never emancipated from the control of their parents. The daughter can only escape from this authority and then only in a limited degree, by marriage, and the son by entering the service of the State. In the provinces alone girls of twenty-one may marry without the parents' consent. The married woman is in the full power of her husband, though she is the mistress of her own fortune. Divorce exists. Russian women vote on an equality with men for members of the municipal councils and county assemblies, and these two bodies choose the boards which transact the public business, such as superintending the collection of taxes, keeping the roads in order, directing the schools, etc. The Russian woman does, not however, appear at the polls, but is represented by some male relative or friend (as we have already seen in Austria) who casts the vote for her. Thus the Russian woman, except that she is ineligible to office, possesses all the political rights of the Russian man—a privilege, however, that is of little value in a country where liberty is crushed under the iron heel of autocracy. The position of the Russian peasant women is not as good as that of the women of the upper classes. They find some comfort, however, in the doctrines of the rapidly spreading religious sects, which resemble somewhat the American Revivalists or Anabaptists. In fact, the subject condition of Russian women is one of the chief causes of the growth of these sects; down-trodden by society and the State, they seek liberty in religion. In some of these sects women preach. Miss Maria

Digitized by Google

Zebrikoff, an able Russian writer, sends me this curious information:

We have lately heard of a new sect which preaches a doctrine exalting woman. She is placed above man, because she can give birth to another being. Her pain and travail are so great, that alleviating the other sufferings and annoyances of woman would be but a poor reward; she is entitled to the deepest gratitude of mankind.

Thought concerning the emancipation of woman was first awakened among the upper classes about 1840, inspired by George Sand, but was confined to a narrow circle of men of science and authors. The new ideas continued to exist in a latent form until the freedom of the serfs in 1860, when they burst forth into life. The reforms of the last reign, the abolishment of bureaucratic government and the emancipation of the slaves, advanced the cause of woman, for the daughters of the office-holders and landowners, reduced to poverty by these changes, were forced to go forth into the world and earn their own living. Woman's success in the walks of higher education—especially in medicine—has been a great victory for the friends of the rights of woman. The government, the professors of the university and women themselves have all united, more or less heartily, in a common effort to give Russian women facilities for a complete education. The first woman's medical school in Russia owes its origin to a donation of 50,000 rubles from a woman. The war department—for Russia thinks of medicine only in its relation to the army—came to the aid of the new movement, and the medical profession, though in a restricted manner, was thrown open to women.* As yet women physicians may treat only diseases of women and children, but, notwithstanding this drawback, there are fifty-two women physicians in St. Petersburg and two hundred and fifty in Russia. During the last war with Turkey twenty women physicians did noble work in the army. Women flock to the universities in great numbers. An attempt has been made to render the profession of law accessible to them, but the government has prohibited it. It is expected that ere long women will be professors in the university. The chemical, medical and legal associations have already received women into membership.

In literature Russian women take an active part; reviews, magazines, and political journals counting many women among their

* Recent reforms in the war department call for economy, and the minister has been forced to refuse the usual subsidy for the support of the woman's medical courses and they are unfortunately in a very critical situation. The result will probably be the foundation of medical colleges for women indpendent of government aid.

Digitized by Google

contributors and in some cases their directors. Writes Maria Zebrikoff:

> It is especially in the domain of fiction that Russian women excel. After the two renowned names of Tourguéneff and Tolstoi, the greatest genius of which our contemporary literature can boast is Krestowsky, the pseudonym of woman.

"The reactionary party," exclaims the same lady with enthusiasm, "counts in its ranks no woman distinguished for thought or talent." Even this brief glance at woman's position in Russia conclusively proves that when the day of liberty comes to the great Cossack empire, the women will be as thoroughly fitted to enter upon all the duties of citizenship as the men. The women of no other continental nation are perhaps better prepared for complete emancipation than those of Russia. Here, as in several other respects, autocratic Russia resembles free America. The good-will of every transatlantic friend of woman's elevation should ever go forth to this brave, struggling people of the North.

The civil law of the kingdom of Poland, a part of Russia, has been, since 1809, the Napoleonic code; the other Polish provinces of Russia are subject to Russian law. Under the former, the woman has an equal share in the patrimony; but the married woman is a perpetual minor. According to the Russian code, on the contrary, a girl receives only a fourteenth part of the patrimony; and when a distant relative dies, brothers alone inherit. But a woman has absolute control of her own property; and when she becomes of age, at twenty-one, she may buy, own, sell, without being subjected to any tutelage, without requiring the consent of the husband—the very contrary of the Napoleonic code. This same thing is true in several other particulars, a striking illustration of the fact that much-abused Russian civilization is in some respects superior to the much-vaunted Latin civilization. In regard to education, the Polish woman is not so well off. In the primary schools alone does she enjoy equal rights; in secondary education she has far fewer advantages than the boy; while as for university instruction, she is forced to seek it in Russia or in foreign lands, the Polish universities being absolutely closed against her. In the Polish provinces under direct Russian authority, the State does nothing whatever for woman's instruction; and in the kingdom of Poland, the same thing is true except in the matter of primary instruction. Polish

Digitized by Google

women may practice medicine, if, besides this foreign diploma, they also pass an examination before the medical school of St. Petersburg. Tomaszewicz Dobrska is one of the few Polish women who has succeeded in this difficult field.

The Academy of Fine Arts at Cracow is open to men alone, but Madeline Andrzejkowicz has endeavored to fill the gap by establishing at Warsaw a school of painting for women. The first woman's industrial school was founded in 1874 at Warsaw, and during the first six years, to 1880, it had 743 scholars. Establishments of this kind are now quite numerous in the kingdom, but, for political reasons, they have not been founded in the Polish provinces of Russia. The unfortunate political situation of Poland, which robs even men of their rights, is an insurmountable obstacle in the way of the emancipation of women. There are, however, many encouraging signs of progress. At Warsaw there is more than one newspaper edited by a woman. Marie Ilnicka has owned and edited for more than sixteen years, at the capital, a paper which is widely read and which has great influence. It is no uncommon thing for women to deliver public lectures, which are very popular and draw large houses. Elise Orzeszko, the distinguished Polish novelist, tells me:

> We have confidence in the efforts of the men who are leading society and who are sacrificing their talents and earnestly toiling to advance liberal ideas. In the meanwhile our duty is to awaken thought on the question of woman's rights, so that when a better day does come to Poland, women may be ready to participate in the common welfare.

But we cannot close this brief sketch without mentioning the Orient, that region of transition between the darkness of Asia and the light of occidental Europe; for, though the position of woman is in general so lamentable that at first glance it seems best to pass over this portion of the continent in silence, one catches here and there a glimmer of progress that portends a better day in the still distant future. And, too, regenerate Greece commands our attention, for she indeed is a rich oasis in this desert of Mohammedan conquest.

There are many Ottoman women, especially among the rich families, who desire to change their dress and enter into relations with the women of other religions, but the ecclesiastical and civil authorities are always ready to check this tendency and to rigorously enforce the ancient customs. In certain harems earnest

Digitized by Google

efforts have been made to establish true family life and to bring up the children under the eye and care of the parents, with the aid of foreign governesses, who, along with the languages, inculcate the habits and manners of occidental nations. Vain attempts have been made to found girls' schools. There are noble natures who long for amelioration of their state, and for progress, but fanaticism condemns everything to mortal stagnation.

The Jewish woman leads a contracted. monotonous existence under the authority of the priest. The wives of many rich bankers have tried to do something to improve the condition of Hebrew women by founding aid societies, primary schools, and normal schools. The Bulgarian women of the country enjoy an agricultural and pastoral life, and those of the city are simple and primitive in their habits and customs. But little has been done for woman's instruction, though some worthy attempts have been made to establish schools. The hope of the regeneration of the Oriental woman lies in the influence of Greek civilization. The emancipation of the Greek woman means the emancipation of the Turkish woman.

The Greek woman in the Orient must be studied under two heads: the Greek woman in Turkey and the Greek woman in Greece. In both cases we find them filled with the spirit of western civilization—perhaps it would be better to say, with the spirit of their classic ancestors. Primary, secondary and normal schools, asylums, hospitals, societies—all for women and generally managed by women—are found in all the Greek centers of Turkey. Calliope A. Kechayia, the cultured principal of the Zappion, the famous girls' college at Constantinople, says:

> The intellectual condition of the Greek woman in the Orient is, generally speaking, not inferior to that of women in many parts of Europe; and as regards the instruction of the girls of the lower classes, it is much superior to that of several Latin countries.

The Greek woman in Greece differs essentially from the Oriental woman. With the independence of Greece came a great patriotic movement for the building up of the new nationality, a movement in which women took a most active and prominent part. Several American women, especially Mrs. Hill, lent their aid and founded the first girls' school at Athens. "A whole generation of women," says a Greek lady, "distinguished for their social and family virtues, received their education in this

Digitized by Google

college." An association of Greeks soon afterward established a normal school for women. The Greek government also early took up the question of popular education without excluding women from its plans. The way in which young Greek school-mistresses hastened all over the peninsula, spreading knowledge, the Greek language and their own enthusiasm throughout the newly liberated nation, is one of the most unique episodes in modern history. "It is true and beyond dispute," I am told by Miss Kechayia, "that the Greece of to-day owes its rapid progress and its Greek instruction to its women." But the Greek woman is more than a school-mistress. The wife of a public man has other than social duties to occupy her. She often represents her husband before his constituents. She participates actively and usefully in many of his political affairs. It frequently happens that the wife goes into the provinces to solicit votes for her husband, and sometimes in drawing-room lectures she defends his political conduct. "In truth these facts would not be believed by a foreigner if he had not seen them with his own eyes," I was once told by a Greek. Associations of various kinds have been formed by women during the past few years, and there is at least one instance of a woman lecturing in public on literary topics. However, woman's rights in the American sense has not yet penetrated into Greece, but from what has just been said it will be seen that when that day comes, the reform will find a soil well prepared for its reception.

Such is a brief and general view of the present status of the Woman Question on the European Continent. It will have been constantly noticed in the preceding pages that in every country there are evidences of progress. Public opinion in the Old World is slowly but surely accepting Voltaire's statement when the broad-minded philosopher says, with a dash of French gallantry: "Women are capable of doing everything we do, with this single difference between them and us, that they are more amiable than we are." In matters of instruction, the ideas of Montesquieu and Aimé Martin are gaining ground. "The powers of the sexes," wrote the penetrating author of the "Spirit of the Laws," "would be equal if their education were, too. Test women in the talents that have not been enfeebled by the way they have been educated, and we will then see if we are so strong." "It is in spite of our stupid system of education," declared Aimé Martin,

Digitized by Google

more than fifty years ago, "that women have an idea, a mind and a soul." And even the more radical utterances of the late Eugène Pelletan find an echo. "By keeping women outside of politics," once said the distinguished senator, "the soul of our country is diminished by one-half." No wonder then that Frances Power Cobbe likens this revolution to the irresistible waves of the ocean. "Of all the movements, political, social and religious, of past ages, there is, I think," writes Miss Cobbe, "not one so unmistakably tide-like in its extension and the uniformity of its impulse, as that which has taken place within living memory among the women of almost every race on the globe. Other agitations, reforms and revolutions have pervaded and lifted up classes, tribes, nations, churches. But this movement has stirred an entire sex, even half the human race. * * * When the time comes to look back on the slow, universal awakening of women all over the globe, on their gradual entrance into one privileged profession after another, on the attainment by them of rights of person and property, and, at last, on their admission to the full privileges of citizenship, it will be acknowledged that of all the 'Decisive Battles of History,' this has been, to the moralist and philosopher, the most interesting; even as it will be (I cannot doubt) the one followed by the happiest Peace which the world has ever seen."

Digitized by Google

CHAPTER LVIII.

REMINISCENCES.

BY E. C. S.

REACHING London amidst the fogs and mists of November, 1882, the first person I met, after a separation of many years, was our revered and beloved friend, William Henry Channing. The tall, graceful form was somewhat bent; the sweet, thoughtful face somewhat sadder; the crimes and miseries of the world seemed more heavy on his heart than ever. With his refined, nervous organization, the gloomy moral and physical atmosphere of London was the last place on earth where that beautiful life should have ended. I found him in earnest conversation with my daughter and a young Englishman soon to be married, advising them not only as to the importance of the step they were about to take, but as to the minor points to be observed in the ceremony. At the appointed time a few friends gathered in Portland-street chapel, and as we approached the altar, our friend appeared in surplice and gown, his pale, spiritual face more tender and beautiful than ever. This was the last marriage service he ever performed, and it was as pathetic as original, his whole appearance so in harmony with the exquisite sentiments he uttered that we who listened felt as if for the time being we had entered with him into the Holy of Holies.

Some time after, Miss Anthony and I called on him, to return our thanks for the very complimentary review he had written of the History of Woman Suffrage. He thanked us in turn for the many pleasant memories we had revived in those pages, which he said had been as entertaining as a novel; "but," said he, "they have filled me with indignation, too, over the repeated insults offered to women so earnestly engaged in honest endeavors for the uplifting of mankind. I blushed for my sex more than once in reading these volumes." We lingered long in talking over the events connected with this great struggle for freedom. He dwelt with tenderness on our divisions and disappointments, and en-

Digitized by Google

tered more fully into the humiliations suffered by women than any man we ever met. His conversation that day was fully as appreciative of the nice points in the degradation of sex as is John Stuart Mill in his wonderful work on "The Subjection of Woman." He was intensely interested in Frances Power Cobbe's efforts to suppress the vivisectionists, and the last time I saw him he was presiding at a parlor meeting at Mrs. Wolcott Brown's, when Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell gave an admirable address on the causes and cure of the social evil. Mr. Channing spoke beautifully in closing, paying a warm and merited compliment to Miss Blackwell's clear and concise review of all the difficulties involved in the question.

Reading so much of English reformers in our journals, of the Brights, the McLarens, the Taylors, of Lydia Becker, Caroline Biggs, Josephine Butler and Octavia Hill, and of their great demonstrations with lords and members of parliament in the chair, we had longed to compare the actors in those scenes with our speakers and conventions on this side the water. At last we met them, one and all, in London, York, Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow, Edinburgh, in great public meetings and parlor reunions, at dinners and receptions, listened to their public men in parliament, the courts and the pulpit, to the women in their various assemblies, and came to the conclusion that Americans surpass them in oratory and the spirited manner in which they conduct meetings. They have no system of elocution in England such as we have—a thorough training of the voice, in what is called vocal gymnastics. A hesitating, apologetic way seems to be the national idea for an exordium on all questions. Even their ablest men who have visited this country, such as Kingsley, Stanley, Arnold, Spencer, Tyndal, Huxley, and Canon Farrar, have all been criticised by the American public for their stammering enunciation. They have no speakers to compare with Wendell Phillips and George William Curtis, or Anna Dickinson and Phœbe W. Couzins. John Bright is without a peer among his countrymen, as are Mrs. Bessant and Miss Helen Taylor among the women. Miss Tod, from Belfast, is a good speaker. The women, as a general thing, are more fluent than the men; those of the Bright family in all its branches have deep, rich voices.

Among the young women, Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Charles McLaren, Mrs. Scatcherd, Miss Henrietta Müller, Mrs. Fenwick

Digitized by Google

Miller, and Lady Harberton, all speak with comparative ease and self-possession. The latter is striving to introduce for her countrywomen a new style of dress, in which all the garments are bifurcated, but so skillfully adjusted in generous plaits and folds, that while the wearer enjoys the utmost freedom, the casual observer is quite ignorant of the innovation. We attended one of their public meetings for the discussion of that question, at which Miss King, Mrs. Charles McLaren, and Lady Harberton appeared in the new costume. All spoke in its defense, and were very witty and amusing in criticising the present feminine forms and fashions. Lady Harberton gave us a delightful entertainment one evening at her fine residence on Cromwell Road, where we laughed enough to dissipate the depressing effect of the fogs for a week to come over the recitations of Corney Green on the piano. There, among many other celebrities, we met Moncure D. Conway * and his charming wife.

I reached England in time to attend the great demonstration in Glasgow to celebrate the extension of the municipal franchise to the women of Scotland. It was a remarkable occasion. St. Andrew's immense hall was packed with women; a few men were admitted to the gallery at half a crown apiece. It was said there were 5,000 people present. When a Scotch audience is thoroughly roused, nothing can equal the enthusiasm. The arriving of the speakers on the platform was announced with the wildest applause, the entire audience rising, waving their handkerchiefs, and clapping their hands, and every compliment paid the people was received with similar outbursts of pleasure. Mrs. McLaren, a sister of John Bright,† presided, and made the opening speech. I had the honor, on this occasion, of addressing an audience for the first time in the old world. Many others spoke briefly. There were too many speakers; no one had time to warm up to the point of eloquence. Our system of conventions of two or three days, with long speeches discussing pointed and radical resolutions, is quite unknown in England. Their meetings consist of one session of a few hours into which they crowd all the speakers they can summon together. They have a few

* He asked me confidentially if I knew what the "D" in his name stood for. "Why," said I, "in line with your profession, it must be for 'Divinity,' or 'Doxology.'" "No," said he, "for 'Dynamite.'" As we were being blown up just then in all parts of London, I begged him not to explode until Sunday morning in old South Church, as I would rather see a wreck of the old theologies than of our charming hostess and Corney Green, who were giving us this pleasant entertainment.

† She says she prefers to be known as the wife of Duncan McLaren, a member of parliament from Edinburgh for sixteen years, who always voted right on the woman question, while John Bright is opposed to the movement.

Digitized by Google

tame resolutions on which there can be no possible difference of opinion printed, with the names of those who are to speak appended. Each of these is read, a few short speeches made, that may or may not have the slightest reference to the resolution, which is then passed. The last is usually one of thanks to some lord or member of parliament who may have condescended to preside at the meeting, or to do something for the measure in parliament; it is spoken to like all that have gone before. The Queen is referred to tenderly in most of the speeches, although she has never done anything to merit the approbation of the advocates of suffrage for woman. As on this occasion a woman conducted the meeting, much of the usual red tape was omitted.

From Glasgow quite a large party of the Brights and McLarens went to Edinburgh, where the Hon. Duncan McLaren gave us a warm welcome to Newington House, under the very shadow of the Salisbury crags. These and the Pentland Hills are the remarkable feature in the landscape as you approach this beautiful city, with its monuments and castles on which are written the history of the centuries. We passed a few charming days driving about, visiting old friends, and discussing the status of woman on both sides of the Atlantic. Here we met Elizabeth Pease Nichol, Jane and Eliza Wigham, whom I had not seen since we sat together in the World's Anti-slavery Convention in London in 1840. Yet I knew Mrs. Nichol at once; her strongly-marked face is one not readily forgotten.

I went with the family on Sunday to Friends' meeting, where a most unusual manifestation for that decorous sect occurred. I had been told that if I felt inclined, it would be considered quite proper for me to make some remarks, and just as I was revolving an opening sentence to a few thoughts I desired to present, a man arose in a remote part of the house, and began in a low voice to give his testimony as to the truth that was in him. All eyes were turned toward him, when suddenly a friend leaned over the back of the seat, seized his coat-tails and jerked him down in a most emphatic manner. The poor man buried his face in his hands, and maintained a profound silence. I learned afterwards that he was a bore, and the friend in the rear thought it wise to nip him in the bud. This scene put to flight all intentions of speaking on my part, lest I, too, might get outside the prescribed limits, and be suppressed by force. I dined with Mrs. Nichol at Huntly Lodge, where she has entertained in turn many of our

Digitized by Google

American reformers. Her walls have echoed to the voices of Garrison, Rogers, Samuel J. May, Parker Pillsbury, Henry C. Wright, Douglass and Remond, and hosts of English philanthropists. Though over eighty, she is still awake on all questions of the hour, and generous in her hospitalities as of yore.

Later, Miss Anthony, in company with Mrs. Rebecca Moore, spent several weeks in Edinburgh looking over Mrs. Nichol's voluminous correspondence with the anti-slavery apostles, to see if anything of interest could be gleaned for these volumes. She found Mrs. Moore as a traveling companion better than the most approved encyclopedia, as she possessed all possible information on every subject and locality, so that all Miss Anthony had to do was to keep her ears open whenever she was sufficiently rested to listen. There, too, Miss Anthony visited Dr. Agnes McLaren, in her *recherché* home, and found her as charming in the social circle as she was said to be skillful in her profession. She spent several days also with Dr. Jex Blake, and from her lips heard the full account of her prolonged struggle to open the medical college to women, and to secure for them as students equal recognition. After listening to all the humiliations to which they had been subjected, and their final expulsion from the university, and of the riots in Edinburgh, Miss Anthony felt that Dr. Jex Blake had fought the battle with great wisdom and heroism. The failure of the experiment in that university was not due to a want of tact in the women who led the movement, but to the natural bigotry and obstinacy of the Scotch people, the universal hostility of the medical professors to all innovations, and the antagonism men feel towards women as competitors in the sciences and professions. Before leaving Edinburgh a public reception was tendered to Miss Anthony, Mrs. Nichol presiding. Professor Blackie, Mrs. Jessie Wellstood, and the honored guest herself, did the speaking. With refreshments and conversation it was altogether a pleasant occasion.

In the meantime I was making new friends in the other parts of the kingdom. Mrs. Margaret Lucas, whose whole soul is in the temperance movement, escorted me from Edinburgh to Manchester, to be present at another great demonstration in the Town Hall, the finest building in that district. It had just been completed, and, with its ante-rooms, dining hall, and various apartments for social entertainments, was altogether the most perfect hall I had seen in England. There I was entertained by Mrs.

Digitized by Google

Matilda Roby, who, with her husband, gave me a most hospitable reception. She invited several friends to luncheon one day, among others, Miss Lydia Becker, editor of the *Suffrage Journal* in that city, and the Rev. Mr. Steinthal, who had visited this country and spoken on our platform. The chief topic at the table was John Stuart Mill, his life, character, writings, and his position with reference to the political rights of woman. In the evening we went to see Ristori in Queen Elizabeth. Having seen her many years before in America, I was surprised to find her still so vigorous. And thus, from week to week, were suffrage meetings, receptions, dinners, luncheons and theatres pleasantly alternated.

The following Sunday we heard a grand sermon from Moncure D. Conway, and had a pleasant interview with him and Mrs. Conway at the close of the sessions. Later we spent a few pleasant days at their artistic home, filled with books, pictures, and mementoes from loving friends. A billiard-room with well-worn cues and balls may in a measure account for his vigorous sermons—quite a novel adjunct to a parsonage. A garden reception there to Mr. and Mrs. Howells, gave us an opportunity to see the American novelist surrounded by his admiring friends. Howells and Hawthorne seemed to be great favorites in the literary circles of England at that time, but I never read one of their novels without regretting for the honor of American women that they had not painted more vigorous and piquant characters for their heroines.

One was always sure of meeting some Americans worth knowing at the Conway's in Bedford Park. We dined there with Mary Clemmer and Mr. Hudson, just after their marriage, and a bright, pretty daughter of Murat Halstead, who chatted as gaily among the staid English as on her native heath. There, too, we first saw Mrs. William Mellen with her daughters, from Colorado Springs, now residing in London for the purpose of educating a family of seven children,* although there is no so fitting place to educate children to the duties of citizens of a republic, as under our own free institutions. If possessed of wealth, they readily adopt aristocratic ideas, and enjoy the distinctions of class they find in all monarchical countries, which totally unfit them for

* She occupies the home of an English woman who has taken her seven children to Germany for their education. How strange it is that so many parents imagine that they can educate their children better in a foreign land.

Digitized by Google

properly appreciating the democratic principles it is our interest to cherish at home.

The Sunday after Mr. Conway left for Australia, I was invited to fill his pulpit. Spending a few days with Mrs. Conway, we attended the Ladies' Club one afternoon. The leading spirits seemed to be Miss Orme and Miss Richardson, both attorneys in practice, with an office in London, though not yet regularly admitted to the Queen's Bench. The topic of discussion was the well-worn theme—the education of girls; but no one seemed quite prepared to take off all the ligatures from their bodies and the fears of everything known or unknown from their minds, and leave them for a season to grow as nature intended, that we might find out by seeing them in their normal condition what their real wants and needs might be. I suggested for their next topic, the proper education of boys, which was accepted. I retired that night very nervous over my sermon for the next day, and the feeling steadily increased until I reached the platform; but once there, my fears were all dissipated, and I never enjoyed speaking more than on that occasion, for I had been so long oppressed with the degradation of woman under canon law and church discipline that I had a sense of relief in pouring out my indignation.

My theme was, "What has Christianity done for Woman?" and by the facts of history, I showed clearly that to no form of religion was woman indebted for one impulse of freedom, as all alike have taught her inferiority and subjection to man. No lofty virtues can emanate from such a condition. Whatever heights of dignity and purity women have individually attained, can in no way be attributed to the dogmas of their religion.

With my son Theodore, always deeply interested in my friends and public work, we called on Mrs. Gray, Miss Jessie Boucherett and Dr. Hoggan, who had written essays for "The Woman Question in Europe"; on our American minister, Mr. Lowell, Mr. and Mrs. George W. Smalley, and many other notable men and women. By appointment we had an hour with the Hon. John Bright at his residence on Piccadilly. As his photograph, with his fame, had reached America, his fine face and head, as well as his political opinions, were quite familiar to us. He received us with great cordiality, and manifested a clear knowledge, and deep interest in regard to all American affairs. Free trade and woman suffrage formed the basis of our conversation; the literature of our respective countries, our great men and women, the

Digitized by Google

lighter topics of the occasion. He is not sound in regard to the political rights of women, but it is not given to any one man to be equally clear on all questions. He voted for John Stuart Mill's amendment to the "Household Suffrage Bill," in 1867, but, as he said, as a personal favor to a friend, without any strong convictions as to the merits of what he considered "a purely sentimental measure."

We attended the meeting called to rejoice over the passage of the Married Woman's Property bill, which gave to the women of England in 1882 what we had enjoyed in many States in this country since 1848. Mrs. Jacob Bright, Mrs. Scatcherd, Mrs. Almy, and several members of parliament made short speeches of congratulation to those who had been instrumental in carrying the measure. It was generally conceded that to the tact and persistence of Mrs. Bright, more than to any other one person, belonged the credit of that achievement. Hon. Jacob Bright was at that time a member of parliament, and fully in sympathy with the bill; and while Mrs. Bright exerted all her social influence to make it popular with the members, her husband, thoroughly versed in parliamentary tactics, availed himself of every technicality to push the bill through the House of Commons. Mrs. Bright's chief object in securing this bill, aside from establishing the right every human being has to his own property, was, to lift married women on an even plane with widows and spinsters, thereby making them qualified voters.

The next day we went out to Barn Elms to visit Mr. and Mrs. Chas. McLaren. Mr. McLaren, a Quaker by birth and education, has sustained to his uttermost the suffrage movement, and his charming little wife, the daughter of Mrs. Pochin, is worthy the noble mother who was among the earliest leaders on this question, speaking and writing with equal ability on all phases of the subject. Barn Elms is a grand old estate, a few miles out of London. It was the dairy farm of Queen Elizabeth, and presented by her to Sir Francis Walsingham. Since then it has been inhabited by many persons of note. It has existed as an estate since the time of the early Saxon Kings, and the record of the sale of Barn Elms in the time of King Athelston is still extant. What with its well-kept lawns, fine old trees, and glimpses here and there of the Thames winding round its borders, and its wealth of old associations, it is indeed a charming spot. Our memory of those days will not go back to Saxon Kings, but remain

Digitized by Google

with the liberal host and hostess, the beautiful children and the many charming acquaintances we met at that fireside. I doubt whether any of the ancient lords and ladies who dispensed their hospitalities under that roof, did in any way surpass the present occupants. Mrs. McLaren, interested in all the reforms of the day, is radical in her ideas, a brilliant talker, and, for one so young, remarkably well informed on all political questions. One thing is certain, those old walls never echoed to more rebellious talk among women against existing conditions,* than on that evening.

It was at Barn Elms I met for the first time Mrs. Fannie Hertz, to whom I was indebted for many pleasant acquaintances afterwards. She is said to know more distinguished literary people than any other woman in London. I saw her, too, several times in her own cozy home, meeting at her Sunday-afternoon receptions many persons I was desirous to know. On one occasion I found George Jacob Holyoake there, surrounded by a bevy of young ladies, all stoutly defending the Nihilists in Russia, and their right to plot their way to freedom; they counted a dynasty of Czars as nothing in the balance with the liberties of a whole people. As I joined the circle Mr. Holyoake called my attention to the fact that he was the only one in favor of peaceful measures among all those ladies. "Now," said he, "I have often heard it said on your platform, that the feminine element in politics would bring about perpetual peace in government, and here all these ladies are advocating the worst forms of violence in the name of liberty." "Ah," said I, "lay on their shoulders the responsibility of governing, and they would soon become as mild and conservative as you seem to be." He then gave us his views on coöperation, the only remedy for many existing evils, which he thought would be the next step toward a higher civilization.

There, too, I met some Positivists, who, though quite reasonable on religious questions, were very narrow on the sphere of

* After dinner, while the gentlemen still lingered at the table, the ladies being alone, an unusual amount of heresy as to the rights of "the divinely appointed head of the house" found expression. A young English-woman, who had been brought up in great retirement, turned to me and said, "I never heard such declarations before; do you ladies all really believe that God intended men and women to be equal, and do you really feel that girls have a right to enjoy as many privileges as boys?" In chorus we all promptly said, "We do," and I added, "If you will recall all the events of your life thus far, and your own feelings at times, you will find that again and again your own heart has protested against the injustice to which you have been subjected. Now," said I, "think a little, and see if you can recall no sense of dissatisfaction at the broad difference made between your sisters and brothers." "Well," said she, "I did often wonder why father gave the boys half a crown a week for spending money, and us girls a few pence; why so much thought and money were expended on their education, and so little on ours; but as I saw that that was the custom everywhere, I came to the conclusion that they were a superior order of beings, and so thought no more about it, and I never heard that theory contradicted until this evening."

woman. The difference in sex, which is the very reason why men and women should be associated in all spheres of activity, they make the strongest reason why they should be separated. Mrs. Hertz belongs to the Harrison school of Positivists. I went with her to one of Mrs. Orr's receptions, where we met Robert Browning, a fine looking gentleman of seventy years, with white hair and mustache. He is frank, easy, playful, and a good talker. Mrs. Orr seemed to be taking a very pessimistic view of our present sphere of action, which Mr. Browning, with poetic coloring, was trying to paint more hopeful.

The next day I dined with Mrs. Margaret Bright Lucas, in company with Mr. John P. Thomasson, member of parliament, and his wife, and afterwards we went to the House of Commons and had the good fortune to hear Gladstone, Parnell, and Sir Charles Dilke. Seeing Bradlaugh seated outside the charmed circle, I sent my card to him, and in the corridor we had a few moments' conversation. I asked him if he thought he would eventually get his seat; he replied, "Most assuredly I will. I shall open the next campaign with such an agitation as will rouse our politicians to some consideration of the changes gradually coming over the face of things in this country."

The place assigned ladies in the House of Commons is really a disgrace to a country ruled by an Empress. This dark perch is the highest gallery immediately over the speaker's desk and government seats, behind a fine wire-work, so that it is quite impossible to see or hear anything. The sixteen persons who can crowd in the front seat, by standing with their noses partly through some open work, can have the satisfaction of seeing the cranial arch of their rulers, and hearing an occasional pean to liberty, or an Irish growl at the lack of it. I was told this net work was to prevent the members on the floor from being disturbed by the beauty of the women. On hearing this I remarked that I was devoutly thankful that our American men were not so easily disturbed, and that the beauty of our women was not of so dangerous a character.

I could but contrast our spacious galleries in that magnificent capitol at Washington, as well as in our grand State capitols, where hundreds of women can sit to see and hear their rulers at their ease, with these dark, dingy buildings, and such inadequate accommodations for the people. My son, who had a seat on the floor just opposite the ladies' gallery, said he could compare our

appearance to nothing better than birds in a cage. He could not distinguish an outline of anybody. All he could see was the moving of feathers and furs, or some bright ribbon or flower.

In the libraries, the courts, and the House of Lords, I found many suggestive subjects of thought. Our American inventions seem to furnish them cases for litigation. A suit in regard to Singer's sewing machine was just then occupying the attention of the Lord Chancellor. Not feeling much interest in the matter, I withdrew and joined my friends, to examine some frescoes in the ante-room. It was interesting to find so many historical scenes in which women had taken a prominent part. Among others, there is Jane Lane assisting Charles II. to escape, and Alice Lisle concealing the fugitives after the battle of Sedgemoor. Six wives of Henry VIII. stand forth a solemn pageant when one recalls their sad fate. Alas! whether for good or ill, woman must ever fill a large space in the tragedies of the world.

I passed a few pleasant hours in the house where Macaulay spent his last years. The once spacious library and the large bay window looking out on a beautiful lawn, where he sat from day to day writing his flowing periods, possessed a peculiar charm for me, as the surroundings of genius always do. I thought as I stood there how often he had unconsciously gazed on each object in sight in searching for words rich enough to gild his ideas. The house is now owned and occupied by Mr. and Mrs. Stephen Winckworth. It was at one of their sociable Sunday teas that many pleasant memories of the great historian were revived.

We went with Mrs. Lucas to a meeting of the Salvation army, in Exeter Hall, which holds 5,000 people. It was literally packed —not an inch of standing-room even, seemed to be unoccupied. This remarkable movement was then at its height of enthusiasm in England, and its leaders proposed to carry it round the world, but it has never been so successful in any other latitude. They not only hold meetings, but they march through the streets, men and women, singing and playing on tambourines. The exercises on this occasion consisted of prayers, hymns, and exhortations by Mr. and Mrs. Booth. When this immense audience all joined in the chorus of their stirring songs, it was indeed very impressive. The whole effect was like that of an old-fashioned Methodist revival meeting. I purchased their paper, *The War Cry*, and pasted it in my journal to show the wild vagaries to which the human mind is subject. There is nothing too ridiculous or mon

strous to be done under the influence of religious enthusiasm. In spite, however, of the ridicule attached to this movement, it is at least an aspiration for that ignorant, impoverished multitude. The first thing they were urged to do was to give up intoxicating drinks, and their vicious affiliations. If some other organization could take hold of them at that point, to educate them in the rudiments of learning and right living, and supplement their emotions with a modicum of reason and common sense in the practical affairs of life, much greater good might result from this initiative step in the right direction.

One of the most remarkable and genial women we met was Miss Frances Power Cobbe. She called one evening at 10 Duchess street, and sipped with us the five o'clock cup of tea, a uniform practice in England. She is of medium height, stout, rosy, and vigorous looking, with a large, well-shaped head, a strong, happy face, and gifted with rare powers of conversation. I felt very strongly attracted to her. She is frank and cordial and pronounced in all her opinions. She gave us an account of her efforts to rescue unhappy cats and dogs from the hands of the vivisectionists. We saw her, too, in her own cozy home and in her office in Victoria Row. The perfect order in which her books and papers were all arranged, and the exquisite neatness of the apartments were refreshing to behold.

My daughter, having decided opinions of her own, was soon at loggerheads with Miss Cobbe on the question of vivisection. After showing us several German and French books with illustrations of the horrible cruelty inflicted on cats and dogs, enlarging on the hypocrisy and wickedness of these scientists, she turned to my daughter and said, "Would you shake hands with one of these vivisectionists?" "Yes," said Harriot, "I should be proud to shake hands with Virchow, the great German scientist, for his kindness to a young American girl. She applied to several professors to be admitted to their classes, but all refused except Virchow; he readily assented, and requested his students to treat her with becoming courtesy. 'If any of you behave otherwise,' said he, 'I shall feel myself personally insulted.' She entered his classes and pursued her studies unmolested and with great success. Now," said she, "would you refuse to shake hands with any of your statesmen, scientists, clergymen, lawyers or physicians, who treat women with constant indignities and insults?" "Oh, no": said Miss Cobbe. "Then," said Mrs.

Blatch, "you estimate the physical suffering of cats and dogs as of more consequence than the humiliation of human beings. The man who tortures a cat for a scientific purpose is not as low in the scale of being, in my judgment, as one who sacrifices his own daughter to some cruel custom." Though Miss Cobbe weighs over two hundred pounds, she is as light on foot as a deer and is said to be a great walker. After seeing her I read again some of her books. Her theology now and then evidently cramps her, yet her style is vigorous, earnest, sarcastic, though at times playful and pathetic. In regard to her theology, she says she is too liberal to please her orthodox friends and too orthodox to please the liberals, hence in religion she stands quite solitary.

Suffering from the effects of the prolonged fogs, we took our letters of introduction from Dr. Bayard of New York to the two leading high-dilution homeopathic physicians in London, Drs. Wilson and Berridge. We found the former a good talker and very original. We were greatly amused with his invectives against the quacks in the profession; the "mongrels," as he called the low dilutionists. The first question he asked my daughter was if she wore high heels; he said he would not attempt to cure any woman of any disease so long as she was perched on her toes with her spine out of plumb. His advice to me was to get out of the London fogs as quickly as possible. No one who has not suffered a London fog can imagine the terrible gloom that pervades everywhere. One can see nothing out of the windows but a dense black smoke. Drivers carry flambeaux in the streets to avoid running into each other. The houses are full; the gas burns all day, but you can scarcely see across the room; theaters and places of amusement are sometimes closed, as nothing can be seen distinctly. We called on Dr. Berridge, also, thinking it best to make the acquaintance of both that we might decide from their general appearance, surroundings, conversation and comparative intelligence, which one we would prefer to trust in an emergency. We found both alike so promising that we felt we could trust either to give us our quietus, if die we must, on the high dilutions. It is a consolation to know that one's closing hours at least are passed in harmony with the principles of pure science. On further acquaintance we found these gentlemen true disciples of the great Hahneman.

Digitized by Google

As we were just then reading Froude's "Life of Carlyle," we drove by the house where he lived and paused a moment at the door, where poor Jennie went in and out so often with a heavy heart. It is a painful record of a great soul struggling with poverty and disappointment; the hope of success as an author so long deferred and never wholly realized. His foolish pride of independence and headship, and his utter obliviousness as to his domestic duties and the comfort of his wife, made the picture still darker. Poor Jennie, fitted to shine in any circle, yet doomed all her married life to domestic drudgery, with no associations with the great man for whose literary companionship she had sacrificed herself. It adds greatly to one's interest in Scott, Dickens, Thackeray, Charlotte Bronté, Bulwer, James and George Eliot, to read them amidst the scenes where they lived and died. Thus in my leisure hours, after the fatigues of sight-seeing and visiting, I re-read many of these authors near the places where they spent their last days on earth.

As I had visited Ambleside forty years before and seen Harriet Martineau in her prime, I did not go with Miss Anthony to Lake Windermere. She found the well-known house occupied by Mr. William Henry Hills, a liberal Quaker named after William Henry Channing. Mrs. Hills received the party with great hospitality, showed them through all the apartments and pointed out the charming views from the windows. They paused a few moments reverently in the chamber where that grand woman had passed her last triumphant days on earth. On the kitchen hearth was still sitting her favorite cat, sixteen years old, the spots in her yellow and black fur as marked as ever. Puss is the observed of all observers who visit that sacred shrine, and it is said she seems specially to enjoy the attention of strangers. From here Miss Anthony drove round Grasmere, the romantic home of Wordsworth, wandered through the old church, sat in the pew he so often occupied and lingered near the last resting-place of the great poet. As the former residence of the anti-slavery agitator, Thomas Clarkson, was on Ulswater, another of the beautiful lakes in that region, Miss Anthony extended her excursion still further and learned from the people many pleasing characteristics of these celebrated personages. On her way to Ireland she stopped at Ulverston and visited Miss Hannah Goad, who was a descendant of the founder of Quakerism, George Fox. She was in the old house in which he was married

to Margaret Fell and where they lived many years; attended the quaint little church where he often spoke from the high seats, looked through his well-worn Bible, and the minutes of their monthly meetings, kept by Margaret Fell two centuries ago.

Returning to London we attended one of Miss Biggs' receptions and among others met Mr. Stansfeld, M. P., who had labored faithfully for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases acts, and in a measure been successful. We had the honor of an interview with Lord Shaftsbury at one of his crowded receptions, and found him a little uncertain as to the wisdom of allowing married women to vote, for fear of disturbing the peace of the family. I have often wondered if men see in this objection what fatal admissions they make as to their own selfishness and love of domination.

Miss Anthony was present at the great Liberal conference at Leeds on October 17, to which Mrs. Helen Bright Clark, Miss Jane Cobden, Mrs. Tanner, Mrs. Scatcherd and several other ladies were duly elected delegates from their respective Liberal leagues, and occupied seats on the floor. Mrs. Clark and Miss Cobden, daughters of the great Corn-law reformers, spoke eloquently in favor of the resolution to extend parliamentary suffrage to women, which was presented by Walter McLaren of Bradford. As these young women made their impassioned appeals for the recognition of woman's political equality in the next bill for the extension of suffrage, that immense gathering of 1,600 delegates was hushed into profound silence. For a daughter to speak thus in that great representative convention in direct opposition to her loved and honored father, the acknowledged leader of that party, was an act of heroism and fidelity to her own highest convictions almost without a parallel in English history, and the effect on the audience was as thrilling as it was surprising. The resolution was passed by a large majority. At the reception given to Mr. John Bright that evening, as Mrs. Clark approached the daïs on which her noble father stood shaking the hands of passing friends, she remarked to her husband, "I wonder if father has heard of my speech this morning, and if he will forgive me for thus publicly differing with him?" The query was soon answered. As he caught the first glimpse of his daughter he stepped down and, pressing her hand affectionately, kissed her with a fond father's warmth on either cheek in turn. The next evening the great

Digitized by Google

Quaker statesman was heard by the admiring thousands who could crowd into Victoria Hall, while thousands, equally desirous to hear, failed to get tickets of admission. It was a magnificent sight, and altogether a most impressive gathering of the people. Miss Anthony with her friends sat in the gallery opposite the great platform, where they had a fine view of the whole audience. When John Bright, escorted by Sir Wilfred Lawson, took his seat, the immense audience rose, waving hats and handkerchiefs and with the wildest enthusiasm giving cheer after cheer in honor of the great leader. Sir Wilfred Lawson in his introductory remarks facetiously alluded to the resolution adopted by the conference as somewhat in advance of the ideas of the speaker of the evening. The house broke into roars of laughter, while the father of Liberalism, perfectly convulsed, joined in the general merriment.

But when at length his time to speak had come, and Mr. Bright went over the many steps of progress that had been taken by the Liberal party, he cunningly dodged all in the direction of the emancipation of the women of England. He skipped round the agitation in 1867 and John Stuart Mill's amendment presented at that time in the House of Commons; the extension of the municipal suffrage in 1869; the participation of women in the establishment of national schools under the law of 1870, both as voters and members of school-boards; the Married Woman's Property bill of 1882; the large and increasing vote for the extension of parliamentary suffrage in the House of Commons, and the adoption of the resolution by that great conference the day before. All these successive steps towards woman's emancipation he carefully remembered to forget.

During Miss Anthony's stay in Leeds she and her cousin, Dr. Fannie Dickinson, were guests of Mrs. Hannah Ford at Adel Grange, an old and lovely suburban home, where she met many interesting women, members of the school-board, poor-law guardians and others. The three daughters of Mrs. Ford, though possessed of ample incomes, have each a purpose in life; one had gathered hundreds of factory girls into evening schools, where she taught them to cut and make their garments, as well as to read and write; one was an artist and the third a musician, having studied in London and Florence. It was during this ever-to-be-remembered week that Miss Anthony, escorted by Mrs. Ford, visited Haworth, the bleak and lonely home of the Brontés. It was a

dark, drizzly October day, intensifying all the gloomy memories of the place. She sat in the old church pew where those shivering girls endured such discomforts through the fearful services, with their benumbed feet on the very stone slab that from time to time was taken up to deposit in the earth beneath their loved dead! She was shown through the house, paused at the place under the stairs where the imperial Shirley had her fierce encounter with that almost human dog, Keeper; she stood in the drawing-room where the sainted three sisters, arm-in-arm, paced up and down plotting their weird stories. She walked through the same old gate, on the same single stone pavement and over the same stile out into the same heather fields, gazing on the same dreary sky above and the same desolate earth on every side. She dined in the same old "Black Bull"; sat in poor Branwell's chair and was served by the same person who dealt out the drinks to that poor unfortunate—then a young bar-maid, now the aged proprietor.

Miss Anthony crossed from Barrow to Belfast, where she was given a most cordial reception at the house of one of Ireland's distinguished orators, Miss Isabella M. Tod, who took her to one of her Ulster temperance meetings at Garvah, where they were the guests of Rev. Thomas Medill, a cousin of the distinguished Chicago editor. There, as Miss Anthony listened to the prayers and exhortations of the Presbyterian ministers and to the arguments of Miss Tod, and heard no appeals to the audience to join in the work of suppressing the traffic, a realizing sense of the utter powerlessness of the queen's subjects in Ireland dawned upon her for the first time. In all that crowd there was not one who had any voice in the decision of that question. The entire control of the matter rested with three magistrates appointed by the queen, who are in nowise responsible to the tax-paying people to whom they administer the laws. Had Miss Tod been addressing an American audience, she would have appealed to every man to vote only for candidates pledged to no-license. From Garvah they made a pilgrimage to the Giant's Causeway. Miss Anthony had, when at Oban, visited Fingal's Cave, and the two wonders that always fix themselves upon the imagination of the youthful student of the world's geography fully matched her expectations.

At Dublin she visited the Castle, the old parliament building, now a bank; Kings and Queens College, that gives diplomas to

Digitized by Google

women; the parks, the cemeteries, the tomb of Daniel O'Connell. She attended a meeting of the common council, of which Alfred Webb, the only surviving son of the old abolitionist, Richard D. Webb, was a member, and there she listened to a discussion on a petition to the queen that the people of Dublin might be allowed to elect their own tax-collector instead of having one placed over them by "the powers that be" at London, as the official thus appointed had just proved a defaulter. In listening to the outrages perpetrated upon a helpless people by foreign officials, the one wonder to her was, not that so many of Ireland's sons are discontented, but that they are not in open rebellion.

There Miss Anthony made the acquaintance of numbers of excellent Friends,* and with Mrs. Haslam visited their large free library and attended their First-day meeting. In Dublin, too, she met Michael Davitt, who seemed to her a most sincere champion of liberty for himself and his people. Miss Anthony spent a week with Mr. and Mrs. Haslam in Cork, visiting Blarney Castle, the old walled city of Youghal with its crumbling Quaker meeting-house and fine old mansion in which Sir Walter Raleigh lived, and thence to the beautiful Lakes of Killarney, and in a jaunting-car through the evicted tenants' district, entering the hovels and talking with the inmates. The sad stories poured into her ears, and the poverty and wretchedness she saw, proved to her that none of Mr. Redpath's revelations, so shocking to the humanity of our people, were in the least over-drawn. The circuit through Limerick, Galway, Clifton and Belfast was made in third-class cars, that she might talk with the people of the working class. This was the season for their county fairs, which gave her an opportunity to see the farmers driving their cattle and taking their meagre products to the fair. The women and girls were uniformly barefooted, while some of the men and boys wore shoes. In reply to her query why this was so, one man said, "It is all we can do to get shoes for them as airnes the money." The same old story; woman's work, however arduous, brings no price in the market.

While in London we attended several large and enthusiastic reform meetings. We heard Bradlaugh address his constituency on that memorable day at Trafalgar Square, at the opening of

* Among these were Mr. and Mrs. Haslam, Mr. Wigham, brother of Eliza Wigham, and his cultured wife; Hannah Webb, the daughter of Richard, and Thomas Webb and daughters, in whose old family-record book of visitors she was shown the autographs of William Lloyd Garrison and Nathaniel P. Rogers over the date of 1840.

parliament, when violence was anticipated and the parliament houses were surrounded by immense crowds, with the military and police in large numbers to maintain order. We heard Michael Davitt and Miss Helen Taylor at a great meeting in Exeter Hall, the former on home-rule for Ireland, and the latter on the nationalization of land, showing that in ancient times the people had many privileges long since denied. They even had forests and commons and the road-side, where their cows, sheep and geese could glean something. The facts and figures given in these two lectures as to the abject poverty of the people and the cruel system by which every inch of land had been grabbed by their oppressors, were indeed appalling. A few days before sailing we made our last visit to Ernestine L. Rose and found our noble coadjutor, though in delicate health, pleasantly situated in the heart of London, as deeply interested as ever in the struggles of the hour.

Dining one day with Mrs. Lucas, we were forcibly impressed with the growing liberality of people of all shades of belief and of all professions. The guests on that occasion were Mrs. Hallock, sister-in-law of Robert Dale Owen, thoroughly imbued with his religious and social ideas; Dr. Mary J. Hall, the only woman practicing homeopathy in England; Miss Henrietta Müller, member of the London school-board; Miss Clara Spence, a young actress from America, who gave us some fine recitations; and such liberals in politics and religion as Mrs. Stanton Blatch and myself, while our hostess was an orthodox Friend. However we were all agreed on one point, the right of women to full equality everywhere. In the evening we went to see Mrs. Hallock's daughter, Ella Deitz, in the play of "Impulse." We urged Mrs. Lucas to accompany us, but she said she had never been to a theater in her life.

A great discomfort in all English homes is the cold draughts through their halls and unoccupied rooms. A moderate fire in the grates in the family apartments is their only mode of heating, and they seem quite oblivious as to the danger of throwing a door open into a cold hall on one's back while the servants pass in and out with the various courses at dinner. As we Americans were sorely tried under such circumstances, it was decided in the Basingstoke mansion to have a hall stove, which, after a prolonged search, was found in London and duly installed as a presiding deity to defy the dampness that pervades all those

Digitized by Google

ivy-covered habitations, as well as the neuralgia that wrings their possessors. What a blessing it proved, more than any one thing making the old English house seem like an American home! The delightful summer heat we in America enjoy in the coldest weather is quite unknown to our Saxon cousins. Although many came to see our stove in full working order, yet we could not persuade them to adopt the American system of heating the whole house at an even temperature. They cling to the customs of their fathers with an obstinacy that is incomprehensible to us, who are always ready to try experiments. Americans complain bitterly of the same freezing experiences in France and Germany, and in turn foreigners all criticise our over-heated houses and places of amusement.

An evening reception at Mrs. Richardson's, in the city of York, gave us an opportunity of a personal greeting with a large circle of ladies identified with the suffrage movement, and a large public meeting the next day in the Town Hall enabled us to judge still further of the merits of English women as speakers. Here I was entertained by Mrs. Lucretia Kendall Clarke, an American, who had spent five years as a student in Dresden, where she made the acquaintance of Mr. Clarke. It is said in England that the American girls capture all the choice young men; that our rich cattle-dealers get all their best horses, cows, sheep, dogs, and that in time we shall rob them of all that is best in the country. One thing is certain, we shall always regret our hospitable invitation to the sparrows, as they are making war on our native birds instead of fulfilling their mission to the "Diet of Worms." In company with Mrs. Scatcherd we spent an hour in that magnificent York cathedral, said to be one of the finest in England. Being there at the time for service we had the benefit of the music. To us, lost in admiration of the wonderful architecture and the beautiful carving in wood and stone, the solemn strains of the organ reverberating through those vast arches made the whole scene very impressive. As women in many of the churches are not permitted to take part in the sacred ceremonies, the choir is composed of men, and boys from ten to fifteen who sing the soprano and alto. But these old ideas, like the old Roman wall that still surrounds that city, time only can remove.

We had a merry trip from York to London. Miss Müller, Mrs. Chant, Mrs. Shearer, Miss Stackpole, in our compartment, discussed freely the silly objections to woman's enfranchisement

usually made by our legislators. We found on comparing notes that the arguments usually made were the same in the House of Commons as in the halls of Congress. If the honorable gentlemen could only have heard their stale platitudes with good imitations in voice and manner, I doubt whether they would ever again air their absurdities. I regretted that our Caroline Gilkey Rogers had not been there to have given her admirable impersonation of a Massachusetts legislator.

A few days later I attended another meeting in Birmingham and stayed with a relative of Joseph Sturge, at whose home I had visited forty years before. This was called to discuss the degradation of women under the Contagious Diseases acts. Led by Josephine Butler, the women of England have been deeply stirred on the question of repeal, and are very active in their opposition to the law. We heard Mrs. Butler speak in many of her society meetings, as well as on several public occasions. Her style is not unlike that we hear in Methodist class-meetings from the best cultivated of that sect; her power grows out of her deeply religious enthusiasm.

In London we met Emily Faithful, who had just returned from a lecturing-tour in the United States, and were much amused with her experiences. Having taken prolonged trips over the whole country from Maine to Texas for many successive years, Miss Anthony and I could easily add the superlative to all her narrations. She dined with us one day at Mrs. Mellen's, where we also had the pleasure of meeting Miss Jane Cobden, a daughter of the great Corn-law reformer, who was much interested in forming Liberal leagues, to encourage the Liberal party and interest women in the political questions under consideration. She passed a day with us at Basingstoke, and together we visited Mrs. Caird, the author of "Whom Nature Leadeth," an interesting story of English life. I found the author a charming woman, but in spite of the title I really could not find one character in the three volumes that seemed to follow the teachings of nature.

Two weeks again in London, visiting picture-galleries, museums, libraries, going to teas, dinners, receptions, concerts, theaters and reform-meetings; it is enough to turn one's head to think of all the different clubs and associations managed by women. It was a source of constant pleasure to me to drive about in hansoms and try to take in the vastness of that wonderful city; to see the

Digitized by Google

beautiful equipages, fine saddle-horses and riders and the skill with which the bycicles were so rapidly engineered through the crowded streets. The general use of bicycles and tricycles all over England, even for long journeys, is fast becoming the favorite mode of locomotion both for ladies and gentlemen.

It was a pleasant surprise to meet the large number of Americans usually at the receptions of Mrs. Peter Taylor.* Graceful and beautiful in full dress, standing beside her husband, who evidently idolizes her, Mrs. Taylor appeared quite as refined in her drawing-room as if she had never been "exposed to the public gaze," while presiding over a suffrage convention. Mr. Peter Taylor, M. P., has been untiring in his endeavors to get a bill through parliament against "compulsory vaccination." Mrs. Taylor is called the mother of the suffrage movement. The engraving of her sweet face which adorns the English chapter will give the reader a good idea of her character. The reform has not been carried on in all respects to her taste, nor on what she considers the basis of high principle. Neither she nor Mrs. Jacob Bright has ever been satisfied with the bill asking the right of suffrage for "widows and spinsters" only. To have asked this right "for all women duly qualified," as but few married women are qualified by possessing property in their own right, the result would have been substantially the same without making any invidious distinctions. Mrs. Taylor and Mrs. Bright felt that as married women were the greatest sufferers under the law, they should be the first rather than the last to be enfranchised. The others, led by Miss Becker, claimed that it was good policy to make the demand for "spinsters and widows," and thus exclude the "family unit" and "man's headship" from the discussion; and yet these were the very points on which the objections were invariably based. They claimed that if "spinsters and widows" were enfranchised they would be an added power to secure to married women their rights. But the history of the past gives no such assurance. It is not certain that women would be more just than men, and a small privileged class of aristocrats have long governed their fellow-countrymen. The fact that the spinsters in the movement advocated such a bill shows that they are not to be trusted in

* On one occasion I counted fourteen: Miss Risley Seward, Mrs. Louise Chandler Moulton, Mrs. Laura Curtis Bullard, Miss Rachel Foster, Mrs. William Mellen and two sons and daughters, Mr. Theodore Tilton. Miss Anthony, Mrs. Stanton Blatch and myself.

extending it. John Stuart Mill, too, was always opposed to the exclusion of married women in the demand for suffrage.

If our English friends had our system of conventions and discussions in which every resolution is subject to criticism, changes could be more readily effected. But as their meetings are now conducted, a motion to amend a resolution would throw the platform into the wildest confusion and hopelessly bewilder the chairman. We saw this experiment made at the great demonstration in St. James' Hall the night before Mr. Mason's bill was to be acted on in the House of Commons. For its effect on their champions some were desirous that a resolution should be endorsed by that great audience proposing higher ground; that instead of "spinsters and widows," the demand should be for "all duly qualified women." After the reading of one of the resolutions Miss Jessie Craigen arose and proposed such an amendment. Mr. Woodhall, M. P., in the chair, seemed quite at a loss what to do. She was finally, after mnch debate and prolonged confusion, suppressed, whether in a parliamentary manner or not I am unable to say. Here we should have discussed the matter at length if it had taken us until midnight, or adjourned over until next day, "the spinsters and widows" having been the target for all our barbed arrows until completely annihilated.

Spending two months in traveling on the continent, Miss Anthony had many amusing experiences. While visiting our minister and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Sargent, at Berlin, she occupied some rainy days, when sight-seeing was out of the question, in doing up papers and writing a large number of letters on our official paper, bearing the revolutionary mottoes, "No just government can be formed without the consent of the governed," "Taxation without representation is tyranny." For a brief period she was in the full enjoyment of that freedom one has when a pressing duty to family and friends has been thoroughly discharged. But alas! her satisfaction was soon turned to disappointment. After a few days a dignified official appeared at the American Legation with a large package bearing the proscribed mottoes, saying, "such sentiments cannot pass through the post-office in Germany." So all that form of propagandism was nipped in the bud, and in modest, uncomplaining wraps the letters and papers started again for the land of the free and reached their destination.

But this experience did not satisfy the "Napoleon of our

Digitized by Google

movement" that the rulers in the old world could securely guard their subjects from those inflammable mottoes to which from long use we are so indifferent. She continued to sow the seeds of rebellion as she had opportunity, in Germany, France, Switzerland and Italy. It is well for us that she did not experiment in Russia, or we should now be mourning her loss as an exile in Siberia. At all points of interest books are kept for visitors to register their names; Miss Anthony uniformly added some of our Pilgrim Fathers' heroic ejaculations in their struggle for liberty, which friends visiting the same places afterwards informed us were carefully crossed out so as to be quite illegible. But we may hope for their restoration in the near future and that they may yet do an effective work. Thus circumscribed with her pen and not being able to speak a foreign language, happily no rebellions were fomented by her rapid transit through their borders.

My sense of justice was severely tried with all I heard of the persecutions of Mrs. Besant and Mr. Bradlaugh for their publications on the right and duty of parents to limit population. Who can contemplate the sad condition of multitudes of young children in the old world whose fate is to be brought up in ignorance and vice—a swarming, seething mass whom nobody owns—without seeing the need of free discussion of the philosophical principles that underlie these tangled social problems. The trials of Foote and Ramsey, too, for blasphemy, seemed unworthy a great nation in the nineteenth century. Think of well-educated men of good moral standing, thrown into prison in solitary confinement for speaking lightly of the Hebrew idea of Jehovah and the New Testament account of the birth of Jesus! Our Protestant clergy never hesitate to make the dogmas and superstitions of the Catholic church seem as absurd as possible, and why should not those who imagine they have outgrown Protestant superstitions make them equally ridiculous? Whatever is true can stand investigation and ridicule.

The last of April, when the wild-flowers were in their glory, Mrs. Mellen and her lovely daughter, Daisy, came down to Basingstoke to enjoy its beauty. As Mrs. Mellen had known Charles Kingsley and entertained him at her residence in Colorado, she felt a desire to see his former home. Accordingly, one bright morning Mr. Blatch drove us through Stralfieldsage over the grounds of the Duke of Wellington, well stocked with fine

cattle, sheep and deer. This magnificent place was given him by the English government after the battle of Waterloo. A lofty statue of the duke that can be seen for miles around stands at the entrance. A drive of a few miles further brought us to Eversley, the home of Canon Kingsley, where he preached many years and where all that is mortal of him now lies buried. We wandered through the old church, among the moss-covered tombstones and into the once happy home, now silent and deserted, his loved ones scattered in different quarters of the globe. Standing near the last resting-place of the author of "Hypatia," his warning words for woman, in a letter to John Stuart Mill, seemed like a voice from the clouds, saying with new inspiration and power, "This will never be a good world for woman until the last remnant of the canon law is civilized off the face of the earth."

Mrs. Mellen's spacious home in Pembroke Gardens, Kensington, was thrown open for her American friends in London to celebrate the Fourth of July. A large number of our English acquaintances were also present, who very kindly congratulated us on the stirring events of that day in 1776. Of the Americans assembled, many contributed to the general entertainment. Grace Greenwood, Miss Rachel Foster, Miss Kate Hillard and Miss Mildred Conway gave recitations. Miss Lippincott, daughter of Grace Greenwood, sang some fine operatic music; Mrs. Carpenter of Chicago sang sweetly, playing her own accompaniment; Mr. Frank Lincoln gave some of his amusing impersonations; Miss Maud Powell of Chicago, only fourteen years of age, who had been taking lessons in France and Germany for some years, played exquisite airs on the violin; Mrs. Flora Stark, Miss Alice Blatch and Miss Conway gave us some fine classical music on the piano, and Nathaniel Mellen sang some pathetic negro melodies.* Altogether it was a pleasant occasion and I felt quite proud of the varied talents manifested by our young people. Some English friends remarked on their cleverness and readiness, all spontaneously called out without any time for preparation.

We heard Mr. Fawcett speak to his Hackney constituents at

* Aside from those already mentioned were William Henry Channing, L. N. Fowler, the phrenologist, and his daughter; Mrs. Louise Chandler Moulton, Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Stanton Blatch, Miss Anthony, Mrs. Powell, Mrs. Wilson, Mrs. Phillips, several members from the Bright, the McLaren and the Cobden families, Mrs. Conway, Miss Emily Faithful, Mr William Henry Blatch, Mr. Stark, the artist; Philip Marston, the blind poet; Miss Orme and Miss Richardson, attorneys-at-law; Judge Kelley, wife and daughter Florence, Miss Lydia Becker, Miss Caroline Biggs and sisters, Miss Julia Osgood.

Digitized by Google

one of his campaign meetings. In the course of his remarks he mentioned with evident favor as one of the coming measures the disestablishment of the church, and was greeted with loud applause. Soon after he spoke of woman suffrage as another question demanding consideration, but this was received with laughter and jeers, although the platform was crowded with advocates of the measure, among whom were the wife of the speaker and her sister, Dr. Garrett Anderson, who sat just behind him. The audience were evidently in favor of releasing themselves from being taxed to support the church, forgetting that women were taxed also not only to support the church, in which they had no voice, but the State, too, with its army and navy. Mr. Fawcett was not an orator, but a simple, straightforward speaker. He made but one gesture, striking his right clenched fist into the palm of the left hand at the close of all his strongest assertions; but being sound and liberal, he was a great favorite with his constituents.

A pleasant trip southward through Bath to Bristol brought us to the home of the Misses Priestman and Mrs. Tanner, sisters-in-law of John Bright. I had stayed at their father's house forty years before, so we felt like old friends. I found them all charming, liberal women, and we enjoyed a few days together, talking over our mutual struggles, and admiring the beautiful scenery for which that part of the country is quite celebrated. The women of England were just then organizing political clubs, and I was invited to speak before the one in Bristol. They are composed of men and women alike, for the discussion of all political questions. The next day I spoke to women alone in the church on the Bible view of woman's creation and destiny. It is strange that those who pretend to be well-versed in Scripture do not see that the simultaneous creation of man and woman and the complete equality of the sexes are as clearly taught in the first chapter of Genesis as the reverse is in the allegorical garden-scene in the second. The drive over the suspension-bridge by moonlight to dine with Mrs. Garnet, a sister of John Thomasson, M. P., was a pleasant episode to public speaking and more serious conversation. There, too, we had an evening reception. There is an earnestness of purpose among English women that is very encouraging under the prolonged disappointments reformers inevitably suffer, There is something so determined and heroic in what Mary Priestman does and says that one would readily fol-

low her through all dangers. It added much to my comfort in this visit to have an escort in Mrs. Lucas.

Later Miss Anthony visited Bristol and had a complimentary reception at the Misses Priestman's. She was the guest of Miss Mary Estlin, who had spent some time in America, a dear friend of Sarah Pugh and Parker Pillsbury. Miss Estlin was from home during my visit, so that I did not see her while in England. The order of English homes among the wealthy classes is very enjoyable. All goes on from year to year with the same servants, the same surroundings, no changes, no moving, no building even; in delightful contrast with our periodical upheavings, always uncertain where we shall go next, or how long our main dependents will stand by us.

From Bristol we went to Greenbank to visit Mrs. Helen Bright Clark, a daughter of the great orator. In the evening the parlors were crowded, and I was asked to give an account of the suffrage movement in America. Some clergymen questioned me in regard to the Bible position of woman, whereupon I gave quite an exposition of its general principles in favor of liberty and equality. As two quite distinct lines of argument can be woven out of those pages on any subject, on this occasion I selected all the most favorable texts for justice to woman, and closed by stating the limits of its authority. Mrs. Clarke, though thoroughly in sympathy with the views I had expressed, feared lest my very liberal utterances might have shocked some of the strictest of the laymen and clergy. "Well," I said, "if we who do see the absurdities of the old superstitions never unveil them to others, how is the world to make any progress in the theologies? I am now in the sunset of life, and I feel it to be my special mission to tell people what they are not prepared to hear, instead of echoing worn-out opinions." The result showed the wisdom of my speaking out of my own soul. To the surprise of Mrs. Clark, the primitive Methodist clergyman called on Sunday morning to invite me to occupy his pulpit in the afternoon and present the same line of thought I had the previous evening. I accepted his invitation. He led the services and I took my text from Genesis i., 27, 28, showing that man and woman were a simultaneous creation, endowed with equal power in starting.

Mr. and Mrs. Clark I found very agreeable, progressive people, with a nice family of boys and girls. Like all English children, they suffered too much repression, while our American children

Digitized by Google

have too much latitude. If we could strike the happy medium between the two systems, it would be a great benefit to the children of both countries. The next day we drove down to see Glastonbury cathedral. England is full of these beautiful ruins, covered with flowers and ivy, but the saddest spectacles, with all this fading glory, are the men, women and children whose nakedness neither man nor nature seeks to drape.

Returning to London we accepted an invitation to take tea with Mrs. Jacob Bright. A choice circle of three it was, and a large server of tempting viands was placed on a small table before us. Mrs. Bright, in earnest conversation, had helped us each to a cup of tea, and was turning to help us to something more, when over went table and all, tea, bread and butter, cake, strawberries and cream, silver, china, in one conglomerate mass. Silence reigned. No one started; no one said "Oh!" Mrs. Bright went on with what she was saying as if nothing unusual had occurred, rang the bell, and when the servant appeared, pointing to the *débris*, she said, "Charles, remove this." I was filled with admiration at her coolness, and devoutly thankful that we Americans maintained an equally dignified silence.

At a grand reception given in our honor by the National Central Committee, in Princess' Hall, Mr. Jacob Bright, M. P., presided and made an admirable opening speech, followed by his sister, Mrs. McLaren, with a highly complimentary address of welcome. By particular request Miss Anthony gave a presentation of the industrial, legal and political status of American women; while I set forth their educational, social and religious limitations. Mr. John P. Thomasson, M. P., made the closing address, expressing his satisfaction with the addresses of the ladies and the progress made in both countries.*

Mrs. Thomasson, daughter of Mrs. Lucas, gave several delightful evening parties,† receptions and dinners, some for ladies alone, where an abundant opportunity was offered for a critical analysis of the idiosyncracies of the superior sex, especially in

* Among the distinguished persons on the platform were Frances Power Cobbe, Dr. Garrett Anderson, Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Jacob Bright, Mrs. Lucas, Mrs. Thomasson, Mrs. Margaret Parker, Mrs. Alice Scatcherd, Miss Becker, Miss Biggs, Mrs. Moore, Mr. and Mrs. Conway, Oscar Wilde and his queenly mother, Charles McLaren, M. P., Mrs. Peter A. Taylor, Miss Helen Taylor, Miss Orme, Miss Müller, Miss Lord, Miss Foster, Mrs. and Miss Blatch, Mrs. Mellen, Miss Tod of Belfast, Mrs. Chesson, daughter of George Thompson, the great anti-slavery orator, and very many others whose names we cannot recall.

† Where we met Mrs. Fawcett, Dr. Garrett Anderson, Sir Hugh Staples, Mr. Mitchell, the Misses Stackpole and brothers, Madame Venturi, Miss Biggs and sisters, Miss Frances Lord and her sister, who is doing a noble work in her kindergarten.

Digitized by Google

their political dealings with women. The patience of even such heroic souls as Lydia Becker and Caroline Biggs was almost exhausted with the tergiversations of members of the House of Commons. Alas for the many fair promises broken, the hopes deferred, the votes fully relied on and counted, all missing in the hour of action. One crack of Mr. Gladstone's whip put a hundred Liberals to flight in a twinkling, members whom these noble women had spent years in educating. I never visited the House of Commons that I did not see Miss Becker and Miss Biggs trying to elucidate the fundamental principles of just government to some of them. Verily their divine faith and patience merited more worthy action on the part of their representatives.

We formed very pleasant friendships with Miss Frances Lord and Miss Henrietta Müller, spending several days with the latter at 58 Cadogan square, and both alike visited us at different times in Basingstoke. Miss Lord has translated some of Ibsen's plays very creditably to herself, and, we understand, to the satisfaction of the Swedish poet. Miss Lord is a cultured, charming woman, attractive in society, and has a rare gift in conversation; she is rather shrinking in her feelings. Miss Müller, her devoted friend, is just the opposite; fearless, aggressive and self-centered. Miss Lord discharged her duties as poor-law guardian faithfully, and Miss Müller, as member of the London school-board, claimed her rights when infringed upon, and maintained the dignity of her position with a good degree of tact and heroism. We met Miss Whitehead, another poor-law guardian, at Miss Müller's, and had a long talk on the sad condition of the London poor and the grand work Octavia Hill had done among them. Miss Müller read us a paper on the dignity and office of single women. Her idea seems to be very much like that expressed by St. Paul in his epistles, that it is better for those who have a genius for public work in the church or State not to marry; and Miss Müller carries her theory into practice thus far. She has a luxurious establishment of her own, is fully occupied in politics and reform, and though she lives by herself she entertains her friends generously, and does whatever it seems good to her to do. As she is bright and entertaining and has many worshipers, she may fall a victim to the usual fate in spite of her admirable essay, which has been printed in tract form and circulated extensively in England and America. Miss Müller gave Miss Anthony and myself a farewell reception on the eve of our departure for America, when we had

Digitized by Google

the opportunity of meeting once more most of the pleasant acquaintances we had made in London. Although it was announced for the afternoon, we did in fact receive all day as many as could not come at the hour appointed. Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell took breakfast with us; Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Seville* and Miss Lord were with us at luncheon; Harriet Hosmer and Olive Logan soon after; Mrs. Peter Taylor later, and from three to six o'clock the parlors were crowded.

Returning from London I passed my birthday, November 12, in Basingstoke. It was a sad day to us all, knowing that it was the last before my departure for America. When I imprinted the farewell kiss on the soft cheek of little Nora in the cradle, she in the dawn and I in the sunset of life, I realized how widely the long years and the broad ocean would separate us forever. Miss Anthony, who had been visiting Mrs. Parker, near Warrington, met me at Alderly Edge, where we spent a few days in the charming home of Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Bright. There we found their noble sisters, Mrs. McLaren and Mrs. Lucas, young Walter McLaren and his lovely bride, Eva Müller, whom we had heard several times on the suffrage platform. We rallied her on the step she had lately taken, notwithstanding her sister's able paper on the blessedness of a single life. While here we visited Dean Stanley's birthplace; but on his death the light and joy went out, and the atmosphere of the old church whose walls had once echoed to his voice, and the house where he had spent so many useful years, seemed sad and deserted. But the day was bright and warm, the scenery all around was beautiful, cows and sheep were still grazing in the meadows, the grass as green as in June. This is England's chief charm, forever green, some compensation for the many cloudy days. An evening reception in Mrs. Bright's spacious parlors, with friends from Manchester and other adjoining towns, with speeches of welcome and farewell, finished our visit at Alderly Edge.

As our good friends Mrs. McLaren and Mrs. Lucas had determined to see us safely on board the Servia, they escorted us to Liverpool, where we met Mrs. Margaret Parker, Mrs. Scatcherd and Dr. Fanny Dickinson of Chicago. Another reception was

* Mrs. Seville, whose husband was a professor at Sandhurst College, having recently awoke to the indignities the church heaps upon women, made her protest in discarding her bonnet and appearing on Sundays with her head uncovered, contrary to Paul's injunctions. Having thus attended church for two years, involving much criticism and disturbance, both the vicar and the bishop labored with her to resume the bonnet, but she remained incorrigible. She read us a letter of remonstrance from the bishop, over which we all had a hearty laugh.

given us at the residence of Dr. Ewing Whittle. Several short speeches were made, all cheering the parting guests with words of hope and encouragement for the good cause.

Here the wisdom of forming an international association was considered. The proposition met with such favor from those present that a committee was appointed to correspond with the friends in different nations. As Miss Anthony and myself are members of that committee,* now that these volumes are finished and we are at liberty once more, we shall ascertain as soon as possible the feasibility of a grand international conference in New York in 1888, to celebrate the fourth decade of our movement for woman's enfranchisement. Such conventions have been held by the friends of anti-slavery, peace, temperance, social purity and evangelical christianity, and why may not the suffrage cause, too, receive a new impetus from the united efforts of its friends in all countries.

On the broad Atlantic for ten days we had many opportunities to review all we had seen and heard. There we met our noble friends, Mr. and Mrs. Hussey of New Jersey; also Mrs. Margaret Buchanan Sullivan of Chicago, just returning from an extended tour in Ireland, who gave us many of her rich experiences. Sitting on deck hour after hour, how often I queried with myself as to the significance of the boon for which women were so earnestly struggling. In asking for a voice in the government under which we live, have we been pursuing a shadow for forty years? In seeking political power, are we abdicating that social throne where they tell us our influence is unbounded? No! no! the right of suffrage is no shadow, but a substantial entity that

* The following is the report of the action prepared that evening by Mrs. Parker: "At a large and influential gathering of the friends of woman suffrage, at Parliament Terrace, Liverpool, November 16, 1883, convened by E. Whittle, M. D., to meet Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Miss Susan B. Anthony prior to their return to America, it was proposed by Mrs. Margaret E. Parker of Penketh (near Warrington), seconded by Mrs. McLaren of Edinburgh, and unanimously passed:

"That this meeting, recognizing that union is strength and that the time has come when women all over the world should unite in the just demand for their political enfranchisement; therefore

"*Resolved*, That we do here appoint a committee of correspondence, preparatory to forming an International Woman Suffrage Association.

"*Resolved*, That the committee consist of the following friends, with power to add to their number:

"*For the American Center*—Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Miss Susan B. Anthony, Miss Rachel Foster. *London Center*—Mrs. Peter A. Taylor, Mrs. Margaret B. Lucas, Miss Helen Taylor, Miss Henrietta Müller. Miss Caroline A. Biggs, Mr. and Mrs. Charles McLaren, Miss Eliza Orme, Miss Rebecca Moore, London; Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, Basingstoke. *Manchester Center*—Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Bright, Manchester; Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Thomasson, Bolton; Mrs. Margaret E. Parker, Penketh; Dr. and Mrs. Whittle, Liverpool; Mrs. Oliver Scatcherd, Leeds; Mr. and Mrs. Walter McLaren, Bradford; Mrs. Philips, Liverpool; Mr. and Mrs. Crook, Bolton; Mr. Berners, Mr. Russell, Liverpool; Miss Becker, Manchester. *Bristol Center*—Miss Helen Bright Clarke, Street: Mrs. Alfred Ostler, Birmingham; Miss Priestman, Bristol. *Center for Scotland*—Mrs. Duncan McLaren, Mrs. Elizabeth Pease Nichol, Miss Eliza Wigham, Edinburgh. *Center for Ireland*—Miss Tod, Belfast; Mrs. Haslam, Dublin. *Center for France*—M'lle Hubertine Auclert, Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Stanton, Charlotte B. Wilbour, Paris.

Digitized by Google

the citizen can seize and hold for his own protection and his country's welfare. A direct power over one's own person and property, an individual opinion to be counted on all questions of public interest, is better than indirect influence, be it ever so far-reaching.

Though influence, like the pure white light, is all-pervading, yet it is oft-times obscured with passing clouds and nights of darkness; like the sun's rays, it may be healthy, genial, inspiring, though sometimes too direct for comfort, too oblique for warmth, too scattered for any given purpose. But as the prism by dividing the rays of light reveals to us the brilliant coloring of the atmosphere, and as the burning-glass by concentrating them in a focus intensifies their heat, so does the right of suffrage reveal the beauty and power of individual sovereignty in the great drama of national life, while on a vital measure of public interest it combines the many voices of the people in a grand chorus of protest or applause.

After an unusually calm, pleasant voyage, for November, we sailed up our beautiful New York harbor just as the sun was rising in all his glory, gilding every hill-top and distant spire in the landscape, and with grateful hearts we celebrated the national Thanksgiving-day once more with loving friends in the great Republic.

Digitized by Google

APPENDIX.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE CENTENNIAL YEAR.

AMONG those who sent most cordial letters of greeting, with requests that their names should be enrolled in the centennial autograph-book as signers of the woman's declaration of sentiments, were: *Maine*, Lavinia M. Snow, Lucy A. Snow; *New Hampshire*, Marilla M. Ricker, Abby P. Ela; *Massachusetts*, E. T. Strickland, Sarah E. Wall; *Rhode Island*, Paulina Wright Davis; *Connecticut*, Isabella Beecher Hooker, Frances Ellen Burr, Julia and Abby Smith; *New York*, Clemence S. Lozier, Henrietta Paine Westbrook, Nettie A. Ford, Elizabeth B. Phelps, Charlotte A. Cleveland, Elizabeth M. Atwell; *Pennsylvania*, E. A. Stetson Lozier, Anna Thomson; *New Jersey*, Ellen Dickinson, S. Mary Clute, Mary M. Van Clief, S. H. Cornell, Emma L. Wilde, Jennie Dixon, Casa Tonti, Marie Howland, Lucinda B. Chandler; *District of Columbia*, Addie T. Holton, Margaret E. Johnson, Sabra P. Abell, Ruth Carr Dennison, Ellen H. Sheldon, Mary Shadd Cary and ninety-four others, Mary F. Foster, Susan A. Edson; *Virginia*, Sally Holly, Carrie Putnam; *Kentucky*, Annie Laurie Quinby; *Tennessee*, Elizabeth Avery Meriwether; *Louisiana*, Elizabeth Lisle Saxon; *Michigan*, Sarah C. Owen, Margaret J. E. Millar; *Illinois*, A. J. Grover, Edward P. Powell, Cynthia A. Leonard, Susan H. Richardson; *Missouri*, Francis Minor, Annie R. Irvine; *California*, Sarah L. Knox, Sarah J. Wallis, Carrie M. Robinson, Mary E. Kellogg, Georgiana Bruce Kirby; *Oregon*, Mrs. A. J. Johns, Eveline Merrick Roork, Charles A. Reed; *Washington Territory*, Mary Olney Brown, Abby H. H. Stuart; *Utah Territory*, Annie Godbe; *Iowa*, Amelia Bloomer, Submit C. Loomis, Philo A. Lyon and seventy-five others of Humboldt, Jane A. Telker, Nancy R. Allen, Margaret Euart Colby, Mrs. Ellen M. Robinson, Mrs. G. R. Woodworth, Mrs. W. W. Johnson, Mrs. Caroline A. Ingham, Mrs. Mabel A. Stough, Mrs. R. H. Spencer, Mrs. J. W. Kenyon, Mrs. A. M. Horton, Miss L. T. Dood, Mary L. Watson, Mrs. Sarah A. McCoy, Mrs. J. J. Wilson, Mrs. F. L. Calkins, Mrs. L. H. Smith, Mrs. Emma C. Spear, Mrs. M. L. Burlingame, Mrs. G. W. Blanchard, Mrs. D. L. Ford, Mrs. E. C. Buffam, Mrs. Cora A. Jones, Mrs. Clara M. Wilson; *Wisconsin*, Laura Ross Wolcott, M. Josephine Pearce, Eliza T. Wilson, H. S. Brown; *Minnesota*, Sarah Burger Stearns; *Kansas*, Susan E. Wattles, Elsie Stewart, Henrietta L. Miller, Lottie Griffin, Jane M. Burke, Malura Hickson, Elsie J. Miller; *Colorado*, Alida C. Avery; *Ohio*, Sarah R. L. Williams, Margaret V. Longley; *England*, Lydia E. Becker, Caroline A. Biggs, Jessie M. Wellstood.

CHAPTER XXX.

CONSTITUTION OF THE NATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

ARTICLE I. This organization shall be called the NATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION.

Digitized by Google

ARTICLE 2. The object of this Association shall be to secure NATIONAL Protection for women in the exercise of their right to vote.

ARTICLE 3. All citizens of the United States subscribing to this Constitution, and contributing not less than one dollar annually, shall be considered members of the Association, with the right to participate in its deliberations.

ARTICLE 4. The officers of this Association shall be a President, a Vice-President from each of the States and Territories, Corresponding and Recording Secretaries, a Treasurer and an Executive Committee of not less than five.

ARTICLE 5. A quorum of the Executive Committee shall consist of nine, and all officers of this Association shall be *ex-officio* members of the committee, with power to vote.

ARTICLE 6. All woman suffrage societies throughout the country shall be welcomed as auxiliaries, and their accredited officers or duly appointed representatives shall be recognized as members of the National Association.

OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION, 1886.

President—Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Tenafly, N. J.

Vice-Presidents-at-Large—Susan B. Anthony, Rochester, N. Y.; Matilda Joslyn Gage, Fayetteville, N. Y.; Rev. Olympia Brown, Racine, Wis.; Phœbe W. Couzins, St. Louis, Mo.; Abigail Scott Duniway, Portland, Ore.

Honorary Vice-Presidents—Ernestine L. Rose, London, England; Priscilla Holmes Drake, Huntsville, Ala.; Mrs. Perry Spear, Eureka Springs, Ark.; Sarah J. Wallis, Mayfield; Sarah Knox Goodrich, San José, Cal.; Mary F. Shields, Colorado Springs, Col.; Rev. Phebe A. Hanaford, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. Eliza Tupper Wilkes, Sioux Falls, Dak. Ter.; Rosina M. Parnell, Susan A. Edson, M. D., Ellen M. O'Connor, Washington, D. C.; Catherine V. Waite, Myra Bradwell, Chicago, Ill.; Zerelda G. Wallace, Indianapolis; Eliza Hamilton, Fort Wayne, Ind.; Amelia Bloomer, Council Bluffs; Mary V. Cowgill, West Liberty, Ia.; Prudence Crandall Philleo, Elk Falls; Mary T. Gray, Wyandotte; Mary A. Humphrey, Junction City, Kan.; Elizabeth H. Duval, Rinaldo, Ky.; Ann T. Greeley, Ellsworth; Lucy A. Snow, Rockland, Me.; Anna Ella Carroll, Baltimore, Md.; Sarah E. Wall, Worcester; Paulina Gerry, Stoneham, Mass.; Catherine A. F. Stebbins, Detroit, Mich.; Charlotte O. Van Cleve, Minneapolis, Minn.; Caroline Johnson Todd, St. Louis, Mo.; Harriet S. Brooks, Omaha, Neb.; Eliza E. Morrill, Sarah H. Pillsbury, Concord; Mary Powers Filley, North Haverhill, N. H.; Sarah G. Hurn, Vineland; Delia Stewart Parnell, Bordentown, N. J.; Clemence S. Lozier, M. D., New York; Amy Post, Rochester; Sarah H. Hallock, Milton; Mary R. Pell, Flushing, N. Y.; Elizabeth Oakes Smith, Hollywood, N. C.; Sophia O. Allen, South Newbury; Sarah R. L. Williams, Toledo; Louise Southworth, Cleveland, O.; Harriet W. Williams, Portland, Ore.; M. Adeline Thomson, Philadelphia, Penn.; Catherine C. Knowles, East Greenwich; Elizabeth B. Chace, Valley Falls, R. I.; Elizabeth Van Lew, Richmond, Va.; Mary Olney Brown, Abbie H. H. Stuart, Olympia, Wash. Ter.; Laura Ross Wolcott, Milwaukee; Emma C. Bascom, Madison, Wis.

Vice-Presidents—Caroline M. Patterson, Harrison, Ark.; Ellen Clarke Sargent, San Francisco, Cal.; Mrs. L. J. Terry, Pueblo, Col.; Isabella Beecher Hooker, Hartford, Conn.; Marietta M. Bones, Webster City, Dak.; Mary A. Stewart, Greenwood, Del.; Ruth C. Dennison, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. C. B. S. Wilcox, Interlachen, Fla.; Althea L. Lord, Savannah, Ga.; Dr. Jennie Bearby, Mountain Home, Idaho; Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, Evanston, Ill.; Helen M. Gougar, Lafayette, Ind.; Jane Amy McKinney, Decorah, Ia.; Laura M. Johns, Salina Kan.; Mary B. Clay, Richmond, Ky.; Caroline E. Merrick, New Orleans, La.; Sophronia C. Snow, Hampden Corners, Me.; Caroline Hallowell Miller, Sandy Spring, Md.; Harriette R. Shattuck, Malden, Mass.; Fannie Holden Fowler, Manistee, Mich.; Sarah Burger Stearns, Duluth, Minn.; Olivia Fitzhugh, Vicksburg, Miss.; Virginia L. Minor, St. Louis, Mo.; Clara Bewick Colby, Beatrice, Neb.; Maria H. Boardman, Reno, Nev.; Ada M. Jarrett, Magdalena, N. Mex.; Marilla M. Ricker, Dover, N. H.; Cornelia

Digitized by Google

C. Hussey, East Orange, N. J.; Lillie Devereux Blake, New York, N. Y.; Mary Bayard Clarke, New Berne, N. C.; Frances D. Casement, Painesville, O.; Harriette A. Loughary, McMinneville, Ore.; Matilda Hindman, Pittsburgh, Penn.; Anna S. Aldrich, Providence, R. I.; Elizabeth Lisle Saxon, Memphis, Tenn.; Jennie Bland Beauchamp, Denton, Tex.; Jennie A. Froiseth, Salt Lake City, Utah; Lydia Putnam, Brattleboro', Vt.; Mrs. Roger S. Greene, Seattle, Wash. Ter.; Alura C. Collins, Milwaukee, Wis.; Amalia B. Post, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Executive Committee—May Wright Sewall, *Chairman*, 429 North New Jersey street, Indianapolis, Ind.; Laura DeForce Gordon, San Francisco; Mary J. Channing, Pasadena, Cal.; Dr. Alida C. Avery, Denver, Col.; Frances Ellen Burr, Emily P. Collins, Hartford, Conn.; Mrs. J. S. Pickler, Falktown; Linda W. Slaughter, Bismark, Dak. Ter.; Belva A. Lockwood, Dr. Caroline B. Winslow, Washington, D. C.; Flora M. Wright, Drayton Island, Fla.; Julia Mills Dunn, Moline; Rev. Florence Kollock, Englewood; Dr. Alice B. Stockham, Ada C. Sweet, Chicago, Ill.; Mary E. Haggart, Mary E. N. Cary, Indianapolis, Ind.; Narcisa T. Bemis, Independence; Mary J. Coggeshall, Des Moines, Ia; Annie C. Wait, Lincoln Center; Henrietta B. Wall, Mrs. S. A. Hauk, Hutchinson, Kan.; Sally Clay Bennett, Mary A. Somers, Richmond; Laura White, Manchester, Ky.; Maria I. Johnson, Mound, La.; Charlotte A. Thomas, Portland, Me.; Amanda M. Best, Bright Seat, Md.; Harriet H. Robinson, Malden; Sara A. Underwood, Dorchester Mass.; Julia Upton, Big Rapids; Cordelia Fitch Briggs, Grand Rapids, Mich.; Julia Bullard Nelson, Red Wing; Mrs. L. H. Hawkins, Shakopee; Mary P. Wheeler, Kasson, Minn.; Anne R. Irvine, Oregon; Elizabeth A. Meriwether, St. Louis, Mo.; Jennie F. Holmes, Tecumseh; Orpha C. Dinsmoore, Omaha, Neb.; Hannah R. Clapp, Carson City, Nev.; Mrs. A. B. I. Roberts, Candia, N. H.; Augusta Cooper Bristol, Vineland; Theresa A. Seabrook, Keyport, N. J.; Mathilde F. Wendt, New York; Caroline G. Rogers, Lansingburgh; Ellen S. Fray, Lewia C. Smith, Rochester, N. Y.; Sarah M. Perkins, Elvira J. Bushnell, Cleveland; Sarah S. Bissell, Toledo, O.; Mrs. J. M. Kelty, Lafayette, Ore.; Deborah L. Pennock, Kennett Square; Harriet Purvis, Philadelphia, Penn.; Lillie Chace Wyman, Valley Falls, R. I.; Lide Meriwether, Memphis, Tenn.; Mrs. D. Clinton Smith, Middleboro', Vt.; Mrs. F. D. Gordon, Richmond, Va.; Eliza T. Wilson, Menomonie; Laura James, Richland Center, Wis.; Barbara J. Thompson, Tacoma, Wash. Ter.; Mrs. J. H. Hayford, Laramie City, Wyoming Ter.

Recording Secretaries—Julia A. Wilbur, Caroline A. Sherman, Washington, D. C.

Corresponding Secretaries—Rachel G. Foster, Philadelphia, Penn.; Ellen H. Sheldon, Washington, D. C.

Foreign Corresponding Secretaries—Caroline A. Biggs, London; Lydia E. Becker, Manchester, England; Marguerite Berry Stanton, Hubertine Auclert, Charlotte B. Wilbour, Paris, France; Clara Neymann, Berlin, Germany.

Treasurer—Jane H. Spofford, Riggs House, Washington, D. C.

Auditors—Eliza T. Ward, Ellen M. O'Connor, Washington, D. C.

CHAPTER XXXII.

CONNECTICUT.

Is the Family the Basis of the State?

BY JOHN HOOKER.

The proposition that the family is the basis of the State has come down through many generations, so far as I know, unchallenged; but in the sense in which it is ordinarily understood, and for the purpose for which it is ordinarily used, it is entirely a fallacy. The State depends upon the family for the continuance of its population, just as it depends upon the school for the intelligence of its people and on religious

Digitized by Google

institutions for their morality. But the State stands in no political relation to the family any more than to the school and the church. What is meant by the proposition as generally used is, that the State is politically an aggregate of families and not of individuals. This is entirely untrue, and if true the fact would be calamitous. Civil government is supposed to have had its origin in family government, the patriarch becoming chief of a tribe which was substantially the outgrowth and expansion of a single family; but if a nation was to be formed of such tribes it would be essential to its peace and prosperity that they should as soon as possible mingle into one homogeneous mass, and that no citizen should consider himself of one tribe rather than another. It is the family idea in a government like ours that makes the feuds which are handed down from generation to generation in some parts of the country. It made the frequent bloody contests of the clans in Scotland, and the dissensions of the Hebrew tribes. In a republic nothing can be more disastrous than that great political leaders should have large family followings. The first duty of the citizen is to forget that he belongs to any family in particular. He is an individual citizen of the State, and when he becomes a magistrate he must practically ignore the fact that he has family relatives who feel entitled to his special favor. He must, like justice, be blind to every fact except that the applicant for office or for justice is an individual citizen and must stand wholly on his personal merits or the justice of his cause.

The proposition that the family is the basis of the State thus taken by itself is entirely false; but even if true, the use made of it as an argument against giving suffrage to women is equally fallacious. This can be shown by a single illustration. We will suppose there are two families, in both of which the father dies, leaving in one case a widow and one son, and in the other a widow and six daughters. Where is now the family representation? The son whom we will suppose to be of age, goes to the polls and we will suppose sufficiently represents the family to which he belongs; but where is the family representation for the other widow and her six daughters? She may be the largest tax-payer in the State, and yet she can have no voice in determining what taxes shall be laid, nor to what purposes the money shall be appropriated.

The question whether the family is the basis of the State cannot be made an abstract question of political philosophy. Indeed the question is unmeaning when put as an abstract one. We might just as well ask, "Is the climate cold in a State?" or, "Is the English language spoken in a State?" It is only as we ask these questions about a *particular* State that they have any meaning. "Is it cold in Russia?" "Is English spoken in Connecticut?"

Take the case of a State ruled by a despot. Here the people are not the political basis of the State, either as families or as individuals. They have no political power whatever. The political basis of the State is the will of the despot. He is himself and alone the State politically. He makes the laws himself, and shoots and hangs those who disobey them. The people are indispensable to the State, and so in one sense its basis, just as the square miles that compose its territory are its physical basis, but the people stand in no political relation whatever to the State, any more than the rocks and gravel of its territory. It is only where the people of the State have the whole or a part of its political power, that the question can possibly arise as to whether individuals or families are its political basis. And when it thus arises, it comes up wholly with reference to a particular State, and not as an abstract question. And then it is wholly a question of fact, not one of political philosophy; a matter for simple ascertainment, not for speculation and reasoning. Thus, suppose the question to be, "Is the family or the individual the political basis of the State of Connecticut?" We are to answer the question solely by looking at the constitution and laws of the State. We look there and find that it is as clear as language can make it that the political basis of the State is the individual and not the family. The individual is made the voter—not the family—and that is the whole question. It was perfectly easy for the people, if they had so desired, when they were adopting a constitution, to make families and not individuals the depositaries of political power, but they chose to give the

Digitized by Google

power to individuals, and thus the question is absolutely settled for the State. It is true, the State does not carry out completely its own theory, but this was its theory, and what it did was wholly in this direction and away from the family theory. We go to the constitution of the State to settle this question, just as we would to settle the question whether the governor's term is one year or two, or whether the judges hold office for a term of years or for life. While considering whether either of these provisions ought to be adopted, we are dealing with a matter proper for opinions and argument, but when the provisions have been adopted, the whole question becomes one of fact, and we look only to the constitution to determine it, and treat it as a matter not for discussion but for absolute ascertainment.

When one is advocating the theory that the family should be the political basis of the State, he is simply saying that the constitution ought to be amended and the right of voting taken away from individuals and given to families. But it is idle to urge this. Such a measure would not get even a respectable minority of votes. It is decisive on this point that not a single representative government, so far as the writer knows, has adopted the theory that the family and not the individual should vote. A law peculiar to Russia gives its villages, in the management of their local matters, the right of voting by families—a perfect illustration, on a very small scale, of the family as the political basis of a State. But here woman suffrage is admitted as a necessary result; and where there is no man to represent the family, or he is unable to attend, the woman of the house casts the vote.

The advocates of woman suffrage have no interest whatever in this question, as it is idle to suppose that it can become a practical one. The writer has taken what trouble he has in the matter solely in the interest of correct thinking.

Hartford, May, 1879.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

NEW YORK.

Brief on the Legislature's Power to Extend the Suffrage, Submitted February 19, 1880, to the Judiciary Committee of the Assembly of the State of New York.

BY HAMILTON WILCOX.

I. LEGISLATURE OMNIPOTENT.—Unlike the Federal constitution, the State constitution does not reserve all powers not expressly delegated. It is held by the authorities that in the absence of positive restriction the legislature is omnipotent.

"In a judicial sense, their authority is absolute and unlimited, except by the express restrictions of the fundamental law" (Court of Appeals, 1863, Bank of Chenango vs. Brown, 26 N. Y., 467; S. P., Cathcart vs. Fire Department of New York, Id., 529; Supreme Court, 1864, Clark vs. Miller, 42 Barb., 255; Luke vs. City of Brooklyn, 43 Id., 54).

"Only on the ground of express constitutional provisions limiting legislative power, can courts declare void any legislative enactment" (Court of Error, 1838, Cochran vs. Van Surlay, 29 Wend., 365; Newell vs. People, 7 N. Y. [3 Seld.], 9, 109).

"Before proceeding to amend, by judicial sentence, what has been enacted by the law-making power, it should clearly appear that the act cannot be supported by any reasonable intendment or allowable presumption" (Court of Appeals, 1858, People vs. Supervisors of Orange, 17 N. Y., 235; affi'g, 27 Barb., 575).

II. POWERS UNDEFINED.—The constitution forbids the legislature to do certain things. Otherwise it does not define or limit the legislature's powers (Art. 3, §§ 3, 18, 19, 24).

III. NO PROHIBITION.—No constitution of New York has ever forbidden the

Digitized by Google

legislature to extend the suffrage beyond the classes specified by such constitution; nor has any ever forbidden unspecified persons to vote. The constitution simply secures the suffrage to certain classes, and there leaves the matter.

IV. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The constitution declares that the object of its establishment is to secure the blessings of freedom to the people (Preamble, Revised Statutes, vol. I., p. 82). Hence it, and all enactments under it, must be understood and construed, where a contrary intent is not clearly expressed, to be aimed at securing freedom to all.

V. DISFRANCHISEMENT.—The constitution follows this declaration by laying down at its outset, as its fundamental principle, that "No member of this State shall be disfranchised or deprived of any of the rights or privileges secured to any citizens thereof, except by the law of the land" (Art. 1, § 1, do., do.). Disfranchisement, then, must be express by the law. It cannot constitutionally be inflicted through mere implication or silence.

Rules for the securing of freedom have often been found to cover unforeseen cases. Such was the fact in the famous decision of Lord Mansfield in 1774, that slavery was against the common law, under which slavery was afterward abolished throughout the British empire; and the decision of the highest court of Massachusetts, that the terms of the constitution of 1780 conferred freedom on the slaves of that State.

Women, it is now fully recognized, are citizens, and hence "members of the State," entitled to the security guaranteed. The *practice* under the constitution has been to treat as *disfranchised* all persons *not specified* as entitled to vote. Though this practice is plainly against the declared object and principle of the constitution, it has been general and mostly continuous, and has thus acquired the force of law. This, however, does not impair the legislature's power to correct the practice by express enactment.

VI. PRECEDENTS.—The legislature *has* repeatedly corrected this practice by express enactments securing freedom to various portions of the people.

(*a*). CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, 1801.—The act calling this convention extended the suffrage for members of that body—*the highest officers of the State*—to "all free male citizens over twenty-one years of age," while the constitution secured suffrage only to male holders of and actual taxpayers on a fixed amount of real estate (Session Law 1801, ch. 69, p. 151; constitution of 1777, do., 1, 39).

(*b*). CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, 1821.—The act providing for the convention that framed the constitution of 1822, while the existing constitution (as above) only specified as entitled to vote, holders of and taxpayers on a fixed amount of real estate—this act allowed *all* freeholders, however small the value of their holdings, all actual taxpayers, all officers and privates, ex-officers and ex-privates, in militia or in volunteer or uniform corps, all persons exempt by law from taxation or militia duty, all workers on public roads and highways, or payers of commutation for such work; to vote on the question whether the convention should be held, to vote in the choice of delegates thereto—*again for the highest officers of the State*—and to vote on the question of adoption of the new constitution—*to exercise a voice in framing the State's fundamental law.* The council of revision, including the governor, which opposed and defeated part of this act, made no objection to this feature (Session Laws 1821, ch. 90, p. 83).

The vote for governor, 1820, was 93,437—the largest ever cast in the State. That on the question of calling the convention in 1821 was 144,247. One act of the legislature thus enfranchised *fifty thousand persons.* The vote on the new constitution stood: For, 74,732; against, 41,402; majority for, 33,330. Thus the votes of fifty thousand persons—enfranchised, not by the constitution but by the legislature—carried the adoption of a new constitution, which further secured to them the freedom which the legislature had opened to them. The vote for governor in 1824—the next hotly-contested election—was 190,545; so that the immediate effect of the legislature's act was to add 97,108 persons to the constituency—to make a mass of new voters who outnumbered those specified by the constitution.

Digitized by Google

(*c*). ALIENS VOTING.—The constitution specifies none but "citizens" as entitled to vote; yet the legislature, by a school law of many years' standing, allowed *aliens* to vote for school functionaries, on filing with the secretary of state notice of intention to become naturalized (1 R. S., art. 2, § 1, p. 65; 2 R. S., 63, § 12; 2 R. S., 1,096, § 31).

(*d*). NORTHFIELD.—The proprietors of swamp-lands in the town of Northfield, Richmond county, were authorized to elect directors of drainage, without any restriction or qualification but ownership (Session Laws 1862, ch. 80, § 2, p. 233).

(*e*). The taxpayers of Newport, Herkimer county, were authorized to vote on the question of issuing bonds to raise money for a town-house. Under this law women who were taxpayers voted (Act April 9, 1873, Session Laws, ch. 187, § 3, p. 304).

(*f*). The taxpayers of Dansville, Livingston county, were authorized to vote on the issue of water-bonds. Under this act women voted (Act April 24, 1873, Session Laws, ch. 285, § 4, p. 409).

(*g*). The taxpayers of Saratoga Springs were authorized to vote on the question of issuing bonds for the construction of an additional water-main. Under this ninety-nine women voted (Act May 13, 1876, Session Laws, ch. 254, § 4, p. 250).

VII. SCHOOL SUFFRAGE.—If the legislature can admit aliens to vote at school-meetings, it can admit female citizens to do so.

VIII. PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE.—1. The federal constitution provides that electors of president and vice-president shall be appointed "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" (Art. 2, § 2).

2. It also provides that "this constitution shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding" (Art. 6, § 2).

3. The legislature has the power under the federal constitution to provide whatever method it may choose for the appointment of the electors. The courts have no power to interfere, and even an executive veto would have no force. The legislature has sole and full power to say who may vote for electors and how the election shall be held.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

PENNSYLVANIA.

BY CARRIE S. BURNHAM.

THE common law of England as modified by English statutes prior to the Revolution has been formally adopted either by constitutions and statutes or assumed by courts of justice as the law of the land in every State save Louisiana, and in the absence of positive statutes is the common law of the United States. To understand the legal status of woman in Pennsylvania it is therefore necessary, *First*—To ascertain her condition under the common law; *Second*—How this law has been modified in this State by statutes.

COMMON LAW.

By the common law, which Lord Coke calls "the perfection of reason," women arrive at the age of discretion at twelve, men at fourteen; both sexes are of full age at twenty-one, entitled to civil rights, and if unmarried and possessed of freehold, they are equally entitled to the exercise of political rights (Blackstone, I., 463; IV., 212; Bouvier's Institutes, 156, 157; Decisions of English courts in 1612, quoted in 7 Mod. Rep., 264).

"By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law"; that is, the legal existence of the woman is "merged in that of her husband." He is her "baron," or "lord," bound to supply her with shelter, food, clothing and medicine, and is entitled

to her earnings—the use and custody of her person, which he may seize wherever he may find it (Blackstone, I., 442, 443; Coke Litt., 112 a, 187 b; 8 Dowl., P. C., 632.)

The husband being bound to provide for his wife the necessaries of life, and being responsible for "her morals" and the good order of the household, may choose and govern the domicil, choose her associates, separate her from her relatives, restrain her religious and personal freedom, compel her to cohabit with him, correct her faults by mild means and, if necessary, chastise her with moderation, as though she was his apprentice or child. This is in "respect to the terms of the marriage contract and the infirmity of the sex" (Bl., I., 444; 1 Bishop on Mar. and Div., 758; 8 Dowl. P. C., 632; Bouv. Insts., 277, 278, 2,283; 1 Wend. Bl., 442, note; 4 Petersdorf's A. B., 21, note).

Woman's character, exposed to the vilest slanders of "malignity and falsehood," and her chastity are protected on account of the injury sustained by the father, husband or master from loss of her services, or wrongful entry of his house, rather than the injury done to her as an individual (Bl. I., 445, note; III., 141, 143, note; 3 Serg. and Rawle, Penn., 36; 3 Penn., 49; 2 Watts' Penn., 474).

The husband is entitled to recover damages for "criminal conversation with his wife," or for injury to her person whereby he is deprived of his "marital rights," or of her "company and assistance"; also an action of *trespass vi et armis* against the individual enticing her away or encouraging her to live separately from him; the offense implies force and constraint, "the wife having no power to consent," and is punishable with fine and imprisonment (Bl., III., 139; 2 Inst., 434; Bouvier's Institutes, 3,495).

The wife has no action for injuries to her husband as she is not entitled to his services, neither has she any separate interest in anything during her coverture. The law takes notice only of the injuries done to the "superior of the parties related"; because "the inferior has no kind of property in the company, care or assistance of the superior, as the superior is held to have in those of the inferior" (Blackstone, III., 143; Bouv. Insts., 3,495).

The husband, by marriage, becomes entitled absolutely to the personal property of his wife, which at his death goes to his representatives; also to the rents and profits of her lands, to the interest in her chattels real and *choses* in action, of which he can dispose at pleasure, except by will. He acquires the same right in any property whether real or personal of which she may become possessed after marriage, and is liable during coverture for her debts contracted before marriage (Bl., II., 434, 435; Bouv. Insts., 4,005; Coke Litt., 46, 351).

At his death she becomes possessed of her wardrobe and jewels, such of her chattels as remain undisposed of, and her own real estate; also quarantine (*i. e.*, forty days' residence in "his mansion"), one-third of his personality absolutely and the use of one-third of any real estate of which he is possessed during coverture for the term of her natural life. *His* mansion, realty and personalty includes what they have jointly earned as well as that of which he was possessed at marriage. The widow's right to one-third of the personal estate was abolished by English statutes prior to the Revolution, but has since been revived by Pennsylvania statutes (Blackstone, II., 129, 134, 139, 436, 492, 493; Coke Litt., 31, 34; Bouvier's Institutes, 1,750; Brightley's Purdon, 806, 2 and 3).

At the death of the wife their joint earnings, also her chattels real, vest absolutely in the husband, and if they have had a living child the husband, as "tenant by the curtesy," becomes possessed of her entire real estate for life. The wife loses her dower by adultery, but the husband does not lose his curtesy on that account. Her dower is also barred by his treason and by a divorce grounded on his adultery (Blackstone, II., 127, 434; Roper, Husband and Wife, 1,210; 2 Kent, 131; 7 Watts, 563; Bouvier's Institutes, 1,732).

A husband cannot convey real estate directly to his wife, but may through a trustee; neither can he give "anything to her nor covenant with her, for the grant would be to suppose her separate existence, and to covenant with her would be to covenant with

Digitized by Google

himself." Their covenants or indebtedness to each other before marriage are by the marriage extinguished (Blackstone, I., 442; Coke Litt., 3, 30; 112 a; 187 b; Connyn. Dig. Baron and Feme, D).

The husband may devise any property to his wife, but the wife cannot make a will, the law supposing her to be under his coercion; neither can she bind her person or property, nor make nor enforce a contract, nor can she be a witness in any matter in which her husband is interested (Blackstone, II., 293, 498, 444; 2 Kent, 179; Bouv. Insts., 1,441; Connyn. Dig. Pleader, 2 A, 1; Baron and Feme, W; 2 Roper, Husband and Wife, 171).

A wife, with the consent of her husband, may act as his or other's attorney, may be a guardian, trustee, administratrix or executrix, but cannot sue in *auter droit* unless her husband join in the suit. This incapacitates her to act independently in either capacity (Blackstone, II., 503; 1 Anders., 117; 2 Story, Eq. Juris., 1,367, note; 57 Penn. St. Rep., 356).

A wife cannot enforce her rights nor defend any action brought against her, but must plead coverture in person, being incapable of appointing an attorney (Bouv. Insts., 2,787, 2,907; 41 N. H., 106; 2 Saund., 209; c. n. 1).

When a woman marries after having commenced a suit, the suit abates; but the husband may *in equity* sue her for his marital rights in her property; marriage of a female partner dissolves the partnership (Bouv. Insts., 4,037, 1,494; 4 Russ. Ch., 247; 3 Atk. Ch., 478; 2 P. Will Ch., 243).

The father of legitimate children is bound for their maintenance and education, is entitled to their labor and custody and has power to dispose of them until twenty-one years of age, by deed or legacy, even though they are unborn at his death. The testamentary guardian's right to their custody supersedes that of their mother (Bl., I., 447, 451, 453; 2 Kent, 191 and 193; Bouv. Insts., 344; 5 Rawle, 323; 2 Watts, 406; 5 East, 221; Purd. Dig., New Ed., 411, 29; 5 Pitts, L. J., 406; 1 Pitts, 412).

"A mother is entitled to no power, but to reverence and respect, from her children"; she has no legal authority over them nor right to their services, but her property is liable for their maintenance if the father has not an estate. The mother's appointment of a testamentary guardian is absolutely void (Bl., I., 453 and 461, note by Chitty; Vaughan, 180; 1 Leg. Gaz. R., 56).

The mother of a "natural or illegitimate" child is its natural guardian, entitled to its control and custody and her settlement is its domicil (Bl., I., 459; 2 Kent, 216; 5 Term Rep., 278; Newton vs. Braintree, 14 Mass., 382).

"Intestate personal property is divided equally between males and females, but a son, though younger than all his sisters, is the heir to the whole of real property" (Bl., I., 444, note by Christian).

Pennsylvania Statutes and Court Decisions.

This "perfection of reason" (the common law) has been changed in Pennsylvania in the following particulars:

All women, married and single, are deprived of political rights by the use of the generic word "freeman" in the constitution (29 Legal Intelligencer, 5).

Heir at common law is abolished by statute; however, the right to administer vests in the male in preference to the female of the same degree of consanguinity. Half-brothers are entitled to the preference over own sisters (Purdon, 410, 27; Single's Appeal, 59 Penn. St. R., 55).

Any property belonging to a woman before marriage, or which accrues to her during coverture by gift, bequest or purchase, continues, by the act of April 11, 1848, to be her separate property after marriage, and is not liable for the debts of her husband nor subject to his disposal without her written consent, duly acknowledged before one of the judges of the Court of Common Pleas as voluntarily given; *provided*, that he is not liable for the debts contracted before or after marriage, or for her torts (Purdon's Dig., 1,005, 13).

Digitized by Google

"This act protects the wife's interest in her separate property both as to title and possession," but "does not empower her to convey her real estate by a deed in which her husband has not joined," nor "create a lease without his concurrence," nor "execute an obligation for the payment of money or the performance of any other act," nor in any way dispose of her property save by gift or loan to him; she may bind her separate estate for his debts, and in security for the loan she may take a judgment or mortgage against the estate of the husband in the name of a third person, who shall act as her trustee (18 Penn. St. R., 506, 582; 21, 402; 1 Gr., 402; 6 Phila., 531; Pur. Dig., 1,007, 21).

The husband is the natural guardian or trustee of the property of the wife; but by application "to the Court of Common Pleas of the county where she was domiciled at the time of her marriage," the court will appoint a trustee (not her husband) to take charge of the property secured to her by the act of 1848. This act, however, does not authorize the appointment of a trustee, to the exclusion of her husband, of property owned by her prior to the passage of the act, nor was it intended to affect vested rights of husbands and does not protect them for the wife's benefit against the claims of creditors (10 Penn. St. Rep., 398 and 505; 18, 392 and 509; 21, 260; 1 Jones, 272).

In a clear case the wife's real estate cannot be levied upon and sold by a creditor of the husband, *but the burden of proof* is upon her to show by evidence "which does not admit of a reasonable doubt," that she owned the property before marriage or acquired it subsequently by gift, bequest, or paid for it with funds not furnished by her husband nor the result of their joint earnings. The wife's possession of money is no evidence of her title to it (18 Penn. St. Rep., 366; 7 Phila., 118).

If no property, or not sufficient property, of the husband can be found, the separate property and goods of the wife may be levied upon and sold for rent or for debts incurred for the support of the family (Purd. Dig., 1,006, 15; 38 Penn. St. Rep., 344).

A married woman's bond and warrant of attorney are absolutely void, nor can she make a valid contract except for a sewing-machine or for the improvement of her separate property, and her bond given or a judgment confessed by her for such debt is void (24 Penn. St. Rep., 80; Act of 1872, Pur. Dig., 1,010).

She may sell and transfer shares of the capital stock of any railroad company, but cannot herself or by attorney transfer certificates of city loan (28 Leg. Int., 116; Act June 2, 1871).

A married woman cannot enforce her rights against third persons, either for the performance of a contract or the recovery of her property, without her husband join in the suit, although the party contracting with her is liable to an action (1 Gr., 21; Act of 1850 and 1839; 6 Phila., 223).

If divorced or separated from her husband by his neglect or desertion, she may protect her reputation by an action for slander and libel; but if her husband is the defendant, this suit, as also for alimony and divorce, must be in the name of a "next friend." She is entitled to a writ of *habeas corpus* if unlawfully restrained of her liberty (Purd. Dig., 510, 12; 513, 24; 754, 1).

The wife of a drunkard or profligate man by petitioning the Court of Common Pleas, setting forth these facts and his desertion of her and neglect to provide for her and their children, may be entitled to the custody of her children, and, as a "*feme sole trader*," empowered to transact business and acquire a separate property, which shall be subject to her own disposal during life, and liable for the maintenance and education of her children. Her testimony must be sustained "by two respectable witnesses" (Pur. Dig., 692, 5; Act of 1855, 2; 2 Roper, Husband and Wife, 171, 173).

By act of April, 1872, any married woman having first petitioned the court, stating under oath or affirmation her intention of claiming her separate earnings, is entitled to acquire by her labor a separate property which shall not be subject to any legal claim of her husband or of his creditors, she, however, being compelled "to show title and ownership in the same." The husband's possession of property is evidence of his title to it; not so with the wife (Purd. Dig., 1,010, 38, 39; 4 Lansing, 164; 61 Barb., 145).

Digitized by Google

A married woman may devise her separate property by will, subject, however, to the husband's curtesy, which in Pennsylvania attaches, though there be no issue born alive, and which she cannot bar (Purd. Dig., 806, 804; 1 Pars., 489; 26 Penn. St. R., 202, 203; 2 Brewster, 302).

The husband may bar the wife's dower by a *bona fide* mortgage given by himself alone or by a judicial sale for the payment of his debts. It is also barred by a divorce obtained by her on the ground of his adultery, and in case of such divorce she is entitled to the value of one-half of the money and property which the husband received through her at marriage (Purd. Dig., 514; 2 Dall., 127; 12 Serg. and R., 21; 1 Yeates Pa., 300).

A single woman's will is revoked by her subsequent marriage, and is not again revived by the death of her husband; a single man's will is revoked by marriage absolutely only when he leaves a widow but no known heirs or kindred (Purd. Dig., 1,477, 18 and 19; 47 Penn. S. Rep., 144, 34, 483).

If the husband die intestate leaving a widow and issue, the widow shall have one-third of his and their joint personalty absolutely, and one-third of the real estate for life; if there are no children, but collateral heirs, she is entitled to the use of one-half the realty, including the mansion-house, for her life, and one-half the personalty absolutely (Purd. Dig., 806, 2 and 3; Act of 1833, 1).

If the wife die intestate leaving a husband and no issue, he is entitled to her entire personalty and realty during his life; if there are children her personal estate is divided between the husband and children share and share alike; in either case he is entitled to their entire joint estate (Purd. Dig., 806, 5; Act of 1848, 9).

Married women may be corporate members of any institution composed of and managed by women, having as its object the care and education of children or the support of sick and indigent women (Purd. Dig., 283; Act of 1859, 1).

It is a crime, punishable by fine and imprisonment, to employ any woman to attend or wait upon an audience in a theater, opera or licensed entertainment, to procure or furnish commodities or refreshments (Purd. Dig., 337, 112).

A man, by marriage, is subjected to no political, civil, legal or commercial disabilities, but acquires all the rights and powers previously vested in his wife. He is capable of all the offices of the government from that of postmaster to the presidency, and of transacting all kinds of business from the measuring of tape to the practice of the most learned professions. Woman, deprived of political power, is limited in opportunities for education, and, if married, is incapable of making a contract; hence crippled in the transaction of any kind of business.

CHAPTER XLII.

INDIANA.

[A.]

GOVERNOR PORTER made the following novel appointment: On August 30, 1882, Mrs. Georgia A. Ruggles, from Bartholomew county, presented to Governor Porter an application for a requisition from the governor of Indiana upon the governor of Kansas, for William J. Beck, charged with the crime of bigamy. Beck had been living a few months in Bartholomew county and had passed as an unmarried man; had gained the affections of a young lady much younger than himself and much superior to him by birth and education. After their marriage the fact that Beck had already one wife became known and he fled to Kansas. Mrs. Ruggles was a friend to the young lady who had been thus duped, and upon learning the facts she called the attention of the proper authorities to the matter, and begged them to effect Beck's arrest. They were not disposed to do so, and upon various excuses postponed action.

Digitized by Google

She therefore determined to take the matter into her own hands. Governor Porter granted her the desired requisition; she went to Kansas, and on September 10, 1882, she received Beck from Samuel Hamilton, sheriff of Ellsworth county; she herself brought the prisoner, in cuffs, to Indiana, and, September 13, she delivered him into the hands of Thomas E. Burgess, sheriff of Bartholomew county. Beck was tried, convicted and sent to the penitentiary. This bit of justice was the fruit of a woman's pluck and a governor's good sense.

EXTRACT FROM GEN. COBURN'S ADDRESS.

The people expect that they will in their own way and time inaugurate such measures as will bring these questions in their entire magnitude into the arena. I hope to see 10,000 women in convention here. They can, if they will, create a public sentiment in favor of their enfranchisement that will be irresistible. They have the ears of the voters; they have access to the columns of the newspapers; they control all the avenues of social life. What can they not accomplish, if, with their whole hearts they set about it? The sphere of public life has many vacant places to be filled by women. Why shall they not serve upon the boards of trustees of our great reformatory and benevolent institutions, as superintendents in our hospitals, and as directors and inspectors in our prisons? The last legislature conferred upon them the right to hold any office in our great school system except one, that of State superintendent of public instruction. From them may now be selected, president of the State university, or of the Normal School, or of Purdue University, school commissioners and county superintendents. But the legislature should give them the power to rescue our prisons, hospitals and asylums from the indescribable horror of filth, neglect and cruelty which hangs like a murky cloud over many of them. Men have tried it and failed. Stupidity or partisanship or brutality or avarice, has transformed many a noble foundation of benevolence into a hell of abomination. Some one must step in to inspect; to enforce order, cleanliness and virtue; to bring comfort and hope to the downcast and to the outcast of society. This purpose must be backed up by the strong arm of power, by the sanction of the law, and that law must have upon it the stamp of woman's intellect. This year the women of Indiana can place themselves in the van of human progress and dictate the policy which mankind must recognize as just and true for ages to come. The public mind is not unprepared for this measure. The spread and the acceptance of great ideas is almost miraculous in intelligent communities.

[B.]

LEGAL OPINION BY W. D. WALLACE, ESQ., UPON THE POWER OF THE LEGISLATURE TO AUTHORIZE WOMEN TO VOTE FOR PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

Capt. W. De Witt Wallace, Attorney-at-law, Lafayette, Ind.:

DEAR SIR: You will confer a favor upon the friends of woman suffrage in Indiana, if you will send me, in writing, your opinion, as a lawyer, in answer to the following question, giving your reasons therefor: Can the legislature of this State empower women to vote for presidential electors?

MARY F. THOMAS, *President I. W. S. A.*

Richmond, Ind., December 30, 1880.

LAFAYETTE, Ind., January 5, 1881.

Dr. Mary F. Thomas, President of Indiana Woman Suffrage Association, Richmond, Indiana:

DEAR MADAM: In your favor of the 30th ult., you ask my opinion upon, to me, a novel and most interesting question, viz.: "Can the legislature empower women to vote for presidential electors?" After the most careful consideration which I have been able to give to the subject, consistent with other duties, and with the aid of such books as I have at command, I answer your question in the affirmative. The grounds of my opinion I will proceed to state: Section 1, article 2, of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that the president and vice-president shall be chosen by

Digitized by Google

electors appointed by the several States, declares in the following words how said electors shall be appointed:

Each State shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of senators and representatives to which said State may be entitled in the congress, etc., etc.

Now, in the absence of any provision in the State constitution, limiting or attempting to limit the discretion of the legislature as to the manner in which the presidential electors shall be chosen, there can be no doubt but that the legislature could empower female, as well as male, citizens to participate in the choice of presidential electors.

Section 2, article 2 of our State constitution is as follows: In all elections, not otherwise provided for by this constitution, every white male citizen of the United States, of the age of twenty-one years, and upwards, who shall have resided in the State during the six months immediately preceding such election * * * * shall be entitled to vote in the township or precinct where he may reside.

Two questions at once suggest themselves upon the reading of this section: *First*—Does the section apply to elections of presidential electors, and thus become a limitation upon the discretion of the legislature in case it shall direct the appointment of the electors by a popular vote? *Second*—If so, can a State constitution thus limit the discretion which the Constitution of the United States directs shall be exercised by the legislature? I shall consider the last question first.

While the legislature is created by the State, all its powers are not derived from, nor are all its duties enjoined by the State. The moment the State brings the legislature into being, that moment certain duties enjoined, and certain powers conferred, by the nation, attach to it. Among the powers and duties of the legislature, which spring from the national constitution, is the power and duty of determining how the State shall appoint presidential electors. The Constitution of the United States declares in the most explicit terms that the State shall do this "in such manner as the legislature may direct." In the case of *Ex-Parte* Henry E. Hayne, *et al.*, reported in volume 9, at page 106, of the Chicago Legal News, the Circuit Court of the United States for the district of South Carolina, in speaking of the authority upon which a State legislature acts in providing for the appointment of presidential electors, says:

Section 1, article 2 of the constitution provides that electors shall be appointed in such manner as the legislature of each State may direct. When the legislature of a State, in obedience to that provision, has, by law, directed the manner of appointment of the electors, that law has its authorities solely from the Constitution of the United States. It is a law passed in pursuance of the constitution.

Hon. James A. Garfield, who was a member of the Electoral Commission, in discussing before that body the source of the power to appoint electors, said:

The constitution prescribes that States only shall choose electors. * * * To speak more accurately, I should say that the power is placed in the legislatures of the States; for if the constitution of any State were silent upon the subject, its legislature is none the less armed with plenary authority conferred upon it directly by the national constitution.—[Electoral Commission, p. 242.

That this section of the national constitution has always been understood to lodge an absolute discretion in the legislature, is proved by the practice in the different States. Chief Justice Story, in his "Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States," in speaking of this section of the constitution and the practice under it, says:

Under this authority, the appointment of electors has been variously provided for by the State legislatures. In some States the legislatures have directly chosen the electors by themselves; in others they have been chosen by the people by a general ticket throughout the whole State, and in others by the people in electoral districts fixed by the legislature, a certain number of electors being apportioned to each district. No question has ever arisen as to the constitutionality of either mode, except that of a direct choice by the legislature. But this, though often doubted by able and ingenious minds, has been firmly established in practice ever since the adoption of the constitution, and does not now seem to admit of controversy, even if a suitable tribunal existed to adjudicate upon it.—[2 Story on Constitution, section 1,472.

Digitized by Google

Judge Strong, one of the justices of the Supreme Court of the United State
member of the electoral commission, in discussing the subject of this section, s

> I doubt whether they [the framers of the national constitution] had in min
> [in adopting this section] the idea of a popular election as a mode of appointir
> electors. They used the word *appoint*, doubtless thinking that the legislature
> States would themselves select the electors, or empower the governor or som
> State officer to select them. The word appoint is not the most appropriate v
> describing the result of a popular election. Such a mode of appointment, I s
> allowable, but there is little reason to think it was contemplated. * * *
> not until years afterward that the electors were chosen by vote.—[Electoral C
> sion, p. 252.

Senator Frelinghuysen, also a member of the Electoral Commission, thus sp
the practice in the several States:

> Under this power [the power given by the section of the national constitutio
> we are now considering] the legislature might direct that the electors should
> pointed by the legislature, by the executive, by the judiciary, or by the peo
> the earliest days of the republic, electors were appointed by the legislatu
> Pennsylvania they were appointed by the judiciary. Now, in all the States
> Colorado, they are appointed by the people.—[Electoral Commission, p. 204.

If then it be true that the power to determine how the presidential elect
be appointed is derived from the national constitution, and that power is a
tionary one, to be exercised in such manner as the legislature may direct, ho
be said that a State constitution can limit or control the legislative discretion?
State can limit that discretion in one respect it can limit it in another, and in
and in another, until it may shut up the legislature to but a single mode of
ment, which is to take away, and absolutely destroy all its discretion, and this
fication, pure and simple. One of the questions before the electoral commi
the case of South Carolina, was whether the electoral vote of that State shoul
rejected because the legislature, in providing for the appointment of the elect
failed to obey a requirement of the State constitution in regard to a regis
This raised, in principle, the very question we are now considering, and on that
Senator O. P. Morton, who was a member of the commission, and who was
lawyer as well as a great statesman, thus expressed himself:

> They [the presidential electors] are to be appointed in the manner presc
> the legislature of the State, and not by the constitution of the State. The ma
> the appointment of electors has been placed by the Constitution of the Unite
> in the legislature of each State, and cannot be taken from that body by the pr
> of a State constitution. * * * The power to appoint electors by a State
> ferred by the Constitution of the United States, and does not spring from a St
> stitution, and cannot be impaired or controlled by a State constitution.—[E
> Commission, p. 200.

The distinguished lawyer and statesman [Hon. William Lawrence] who m
principle argument before the commission in favor of admitting the vote of th
took the same ground (Electoral Commission, p. 186).

The opinion of Justice Story, expressed in the Massachusetts constitutional
tion of 1820, on a very similar question, and one involving the same principle,
by Mr. Lawrence in his argument, is very high authority, and I reproduce
He (Justice Story) said:

> The question then was whether we have a right to insert in our constitutio
> vision which controls or destroys a discretion which may be, nay *must* be, exer
> the legislature in *virtue* of *powers confided* to it by the Constitution of the
> States. The fourth section of the first article of the Constitution of the Unite
> declares that the times, places and manner of holding elections for senators an
> sentatives shall be prescribed by the legislature thereof. Here an express p
> was made for the manner of choosing representatives by the State legislatures.
> have an *unlimited* discretion on the subject. They may provide for an ele
> districts sending more than one, or by general ticket for the whole State. H
> general discretion, a power of choice. What is the proposition on the table?
> limit the discretion, to leave no choice to the legislature, to compel representa

Digitized by Google

be chosen in districts; in other words to compel them to be chosen in a specific manner, excluding all others. Were not this plainly a violation of the constitution? Does it not affect to control the legislature in the exercise of its powers? * * * It assumes a control over the legislature, which the Constitution of the United States does not justify. It is bound to exercise its authority according to its *own view* of *public policy* and *principle;* and yet this proposition compels it to surrender all discretion. In my humble judgment * * * it is a direct and palpable infringement of the constitutional provisions to which I have referred.—[Electoral Commission, p. 186.

The conclusion seems irresistible that a State constitution cannot determine for the legislature who shall, or shall not, participate in the choice of presidential electors, and that in so far as our State constitution may attempt to do so, it is an infringement of the national constitution. The discretion of the legislature, by virtue of the supreme law of the land, being (except in so far as it is controlled by the national constitution itself) thus absolutely unlimited, it may, without doubt, as I think, authorize all citizens without regard to sex, to participate in the choice of presidential electors. But it has been suggested to me that possibly by the State legislature, as used in the section of the national constitution which we have been considering, was meant the whole people of the State in whom the legislative power originally resides and not the organized legislative body which they may create. We answer first that the language of the section will not admit of this construction. It clearly recognizes a distinction between the State or the people of the State, and its legislature. The language is not "each State shall appoint in such manner as *it* may direct," etc., but it is, "each State shall appoint in such manner as the *legislature* thereof may direct," etc.

Again, it is a familiar canon of construction that in determining the meaning of a statute, recourse may be had to the history of the times in which it was enacted. When the Constitution of the United States was framed, all of the States had organized legislatures, or representative bodies who wielded the legislative power, and without doing violence to language, we must suppose that it was to *them* the constitution referred. Again, the State legislatures are referred to not less than ten times in the national constitution, and in each instance the reference is such as to make it clear that the organized representative bodies are intended, and in article 5 they are, in express terms, distinguished from conventions of the States. Indeed, the fundamental idea of the American government is that of a representative republic as opposed to a pure democracy, and it may well be doubted whether a State government, without a representative legislative body of some kind, would, in the American sense, be republican in form.

Finally, it is apparent from the debates in the constitutional convention which framed the constitution, and from the whole plan devised for the election of president and vice-president, that it was not intended by the framers of the constitution to commit directly to the whole people of a State the authority to determine how the presidential electors should be chosen. Nothing seems to have given the convention more trouble than the mode of selecting a president. Many plans were proposed. Chief among these were: election by congress; election by the executives of the States; election by the people; election by the State legislatures; and election by electors. These were presented in many forms. The convention decided not less than three times, and once by a unanimous vote, in favor of election by the national congress, and as often reconsidered it (2 Madison Papers, pp. 770, 1,124, 1,190). The proposition that the president should be elected directly by the people, instead of by the national congress, received but one vote, while the proposition that he should be appointed by the State legislatures received two votes (2 Madison Papers, p. 1,124). The most cursory examination of the debates will, I think, convince any mind that it was to the *organized* legislature of the State, and not to the people of a State, that the framers of the constitution intended to commit the power of determining how the presidential electors should be chosen. It seems, both from the debates and the plan adopted, to have been their studied effort to prevent the people from acting in the choice of their chief magistrate otherwise than through their representatives, and in

no single step of the process are the people directly required or authorized by the national constitution to act, but in every instance the duty and the authority are devolved upon their representatives. For these reasons I think it clear that it was intended to invest the organized State legislatures with the power of determining how the presidential electors should be chosen, and that the discretion thus lodged in the legislature cannot be limited or controlled by a State constitution. W. DE WITT WALLACE.

[C.]

In 1868, the Indiana (Friends) Yearly Meeting appointed Mrs. Sarah J. Smith of Indianapolis, and Mrs. Rhoda M. Coffin of Richmond, to visit the prisons of the State, with a view to ascertain the spirit of the management of these institutions, and the moral condition of their inmates. In obedience to this appointment the two ladies visited both of the State prisons of Indiana, and made a particularly thorough examination of the condition of the Southern prison (at Jeffersonville) where all our women convicts were kept. Here they found the vilest immoralities being practiced; they discovered that the rumors which had induced their appointment were far surpassed by the revolting facts.

They visited Gov. Conrad Baker and urged him to recommend the General Assembly to make an appropriation for a separate prison for women. With the full sympathy of Governor Baker, who was not only a most honorable gentleman, but a sincere believer in the equal political rights of women, Mrs. Smith and Mrs. Coffin appeared before the legislature of 1869, and by an unvarnished account of what they had witnessed and learned in the Southern prison, they aroused the legislators to immediate action, and an act to establish a "Reformatory Institution for Women and Girls" was passed at that session (viz., that of 1869). By statute the new institution was located at Indianapolis. It was opened in 1873, the first separate prison for women in this country. Mrs. Sarah J. Smith was made its first superintendent, and she retained that office, discharging all its duties with great ability, until 1883, when upon her resignation she was succeeded by Mrs. Elmina S. Johnson, who had up to that time been associated with Mrs. Smith as assistant superintendent.

The first managing board of women consisted of Mrs. Eliza C. Hendricks (wife of Hon. Thomas A. Hendricks who was governor of Indiana on the opening of the prison), Mrs. Rhoda M. Coffin and Mrs. Emily A. Roach. The changes upon the board have been so infrequent that in addition to those on the first board and to those on the board at present, only three ladies can be mentioned in this connection, viz.: Mrs. Eliza S. Dodd of Indianapolis, Mrs. Mary E. Burson (a banker of Muncie) and Mrs. Sarah J. Smith, who, after resigning the superintendency, served on the board for a brief time.

The board at present consists of Mrs. Eliza C. Hendricks, president, Mrs. Claire A. Walker and Mrs. M. M. James. From the opening of this institution Mrs. Hendricks has been connected with it; first as a member of the advisory board, for eight years a member of the managing board and during a large part of the time its president, she has served its interest with singular fidelity. The position is no sinecure. The purchasing of all the supplies is only a part of the board's work; the business meetings are held monthly and often occupy half a day, sometimes an entire day. These Mrs. Hendricks always attends whether she is in Indianapolis or in Washington; from the latter point she has many times journeyed in weather most inclement by heat and by cold, simply to look after the prison and to transact the business for it imposed by her position on its board. During the last eight years, since women have had control of its affairs, Miss Anna Dunlop of Indianapolis has served the institution as its secretary and treasurer. Perhaps the highest tribute that can be paid to the ability with which Miss Dunlop has discharged the responsible and complicated duties of her double office, lies in the fact that with the General Assembly of the State it has passed into a proverb that "The Woman's Reformatory is the best and most economically managed of the State institutions." The committees appointed to visit

Digitized by Google

the penal institutions always report that "The accounts of the reformatory are kept so accurately that its financial status can always be understood at a glance."

This institution has two distinct departments, the penal and the reformatory, occupying two sides of one main building and joined under one management. Convicts above sixteen years of age are ranked as women and confined in the penal department; those under sixteen years are accounted girls (children) and lodged in the reformatory department.

The average number of girls in the institution from its opening has been 150; the number of women 45. There are now (July, 1885,) over 200 inmates.

All of the work of the institution is done by its inmates. A school is maintained in the building for the children; a few trades are taught the girls; all are taught housework, laundry work, plain sewing and mending; the greatest pains is taken to form in the inmates habits of industry and personal tidiness, and to prepare them to be good servants; and when their period of incarceration has expired, the ladies interest themselves in finding homes and employment for the discharged convicts whom they seek to restore to normal relations to society. The secretary estimates that of those who have been discharged from the institution during the last twelve years, fully seventy-five per cent. have been really restored and are leading honest and industrious lives.

[D.]

GOV. PORTER'S BIENNIAL MESSAGE, 1883: "I recommend that in the department for women in this hospital it shall be required by law that at least one of the physicians shall be a woman. There are now in this State not a few women who bear diplomas from respectable medical colleges, and who are qualified by professional attainments and experience to fill places as physicians in public institutions with credit and usefulness. It would be peculiarly fit that their services should be sought in cases of insanity among members of their own sex."

[E.]

About the year 1867, Miss Lucinda B. Jenkins, formerly of Wayne county, Indiana, left her work among the "Freedmen" in the South, to accept the position of matron in "The Soldiers' Orphans' Home" at Knightstown, Indiana. She afterwards became the wife of Dr. Wishard, the superintendent; and when the office was vacated by his death, she was authorized to assume his responsibilities, and perform his duties, with the exception of receipting bills and drawing appropriations, which latter duties, not being then considered as within the province of a woman, were delegated to the steward until the doctor's successor could be legally appointed.

She was a lady of intelligence and true moral worth, possessing a dignified, pleasing manner, and other good qualities, which, with her long experience as co-manager of the institution, admirably fitted her for the position of superintendent; but she was a woman, without a vote or political influence, and it was necessary that "party debts" should be paid. She therefore continued her influence for the good of the institution without public recognition until 1882, when she left to take charge of a private orphan asylum under the management of ladies of Indianapolis.

[F.]

Miss Susan Fussell is the daughter of the late Dr. B. Fussell of Philadelphia, to whom, with his estimable wife, women are indebted as the founder of the first medical college for women in the United States. At that period of our civil war, when women were admitted to the hospitals as nurses, Miss Fussell was at her brother's home at Pendleton, Indiana. She immediately volunteered her services, and was assigned to duty by the Indiana sanitary commission in the military hospitals in Louisville, Kentucky, where she served faithfully until the close of the war, giving the bloom of her youth to her country without hope of reward other than that which comes to all as the result of self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of humanity.

At the close of the war she returned to Philadelphia, but learning soon that an effort was being made to induce the State of Indiana to provide a home for the soldiers' orphans, she again offered her services in any useful capacity in that work. A benevolent gentleman of Indianapolis who had been most urgent in calling the attention of the officers of the State to their duty in that matter, finding that there was no hope, offered to furnish Miss Fussell with the money necessary to clothe, rear, educate and care for a family of ten orphans of soldiers, and bring them up to maturity, if she would furnish the motherly love, the years of hard labor and self-sacrifice, the sleepless nights and endless patience needed for the work. After a few days of prayerful consideration she accepted, and in the fall of 1865 ten orphans were gathered together in Indianapolis from various parts of the State from among those who had no friends able or willing to care for them. In the spring of 1866 they were removed to the Soldiers' Home near Knightstown, where a small cottage and garden were assigned to their use. In 1875, she placed the older boys in houses where their growing strength could be better utilized, and moved with the girls and younger boys to Spiceland to secure the benefit of better schools. In 1877, all of the ten but one were self-supporting, and have since taken useful and respectable positions in society. The one exception was a little feeble-minded boy, who, with his brother, had been found in the county poor-house; his condition and wants very soon impressed her with the necessity for a State home for feeble-minded children in Indiana, it having been found necessary to send this boy to another State to be educated. He is now in a neighboring State institution, and is almost self-supporting. With her usual energy and directness, she went to work to gather statistics on the subject of "Feeble-minded Children" in this and other States, and to interest others in their welfare. She at last found an active co-worker in Charles Hubbard, the representative from Henry county in the legislature, and their united efforts, aided by other friends of the cause, secured in 1876 the enactment of the law establishing the Home for Feeble-minded Children, now in operation near Knightstown, Indiana.

Having seen all her children well provided for, she began to look for further work, and soon conceived the idea of taking the children from the county poor-houses of the State and forming them into families. She offered to take the children in the Henry county poor-house and provide for them home, food, clothing and education, for the small sum of twenty-five cents per day for each child, which her experience had proven to be the smallest sum that would accomplish the good she desired; but the county commissioners would only allow her twenty cents per day. She accepted their terms, furnishing the deficit from her own means, and so earnest was she and so completely did she demonstrate the superiority of her plan for the care of these children, that she interested many others in the work, and the result was the passage of a law by the legislature of 1880–1881, giving to county commissioners the right to place their destitute children under the care of a matron, giving her sole charge of them and full credit for her work, and providing for her salary and their support. Under that law Miss Fussell now has all the destitute children of Henry county under her care, and has created a model orphans' home. Thus has this one woman been a power for good, and by following in the direct line of her duty, has been obliged to "meddle in the affairs of State" and to influence legislation.

If in giving this sketch we have exceeded the limits allotted us, let us remember that our subject represents thousands of noble women who care rather that their light shall carry with it comfort and warmth, than be noted for its brilliancy, and who, having no voice in the government, are obliged to work out their beneficent ideas with much unnecessary labor.

[G.]

The friends of woman's equality addressed the following petition to each member of the State legislature:

Being personally acquainted with Mrs. SARAH A. OREN, and knowing her to be a woman of refinement and culture, we can consistently urge upon you a favorable con-

Digitized by Google

sideration of her claims as a candidate for election to the office of State librarian. She has had the benefit of a collegiate education, and has been for several years a successful teacher in Antioch College and in the public high-school of Indianapolis. She is mainly dependent on her own labor for the means to support and educate her children, who were *made fatherless by a rebel bullet* at the siege of Petersburg. Her education and experience have admirably fitted her for the discharge of all the duties of the office of State librarian; and by electing her to that office, the Republican party will secure a faithful and efficient officer, and have the pleasure of making another payment on the debt we owe to the widows and orphans of those who died that our country might live.*

Mrs. Oren was elected to the office of State librarian and performed the duties belonging to it with great efficiency and fidelity. She has been succeeded by Mrs. Margaret Peele, Mrs. Emma A. Winsor and Miss Lizzie H. Callis.

CHAPTER XLVII.

MINNESOTA.

[A.]

In the early days, long before the organization of either State or local societies, there were, besides those mentioned in the main chapter, a few earnest women who were ever ready to subscribe for suffrage papers and circulate tracts and petitions to congress and the State legislature, whose names should be honored with at least a mention on the page of history. Among them were: Mrs. Addie Ballou, Mrs. Ellis White, Mrs. Eliza Dutcher, Mrs. Sarah Clark, Miss Amelia Heebner, Miss Emily A. Emerson, Mrs. Mary F. Mead, Mrs. E. M. O'Brien, Miss Ellen C. Thompson, Miss R. J. Haner, Mrs. Mary Hulett, Mrs. Gorham Powers, Mrs. C. A. Hotchkiss, Mrs. Emma Wilson, Mrs. Mary Wilkins, Mrs. Anna D. Weeks, Mrs. Mary Leland, Mrs. Susan C. Burger, Mrs. A. R. Lovejoy, and others.

[B.]

Of the seventy-six organized counties in Minnesota we give the following partial list of those that have elected women to the office of superintendent of public schools: *Mille Lacs County*, Olive R. Barker; *Pine*, Ella Gorton; *Lac Qui Parle*, Malena P. Kirley; *Anoka*, Mrs. Catharine J. Pierce, Mrs. Ellen Conforth, Miss Dailey; *Benton*, Mrs. Belle Graham, Mrs. E. K. Whitney; *Cottonwood*, Mrs. E. C. Huntington, Mrs. B. J. Banks, Mrs. L. Huntington; *Dodge*, Mrs. Mary Powell Wheeler, Mrs. P. L. Dart, Mrs. J. W. Willard, Barbara Van Allen; *Dakota*, Mrs. Martha Wallace, Harriet E. Jones, Mrs. C. H. Day, Mrs. C. Teachout, Nellie Duff, Mary Mather, Anna Manners, Jennie Horton; *Freeborn*, Mrs. J. B. Foote, Mrs. D. R. Hibbs, Mrs. A.

---

* Signed by Superintendents Public Schools, A. C. Shortridge, Indianapolis, Alexander M. Gow, Evansville, Wm. H. Wiley, Terre Haute, Jas. McNeil, Richmond, J. H. Smart, Fort Wayne, Wm Phelan, Laporte, Barnabas C. Hobbs, Bloomingdale; Thomas Holmes, president Union Christian College, Mrs. Thos. Holmes, Merom; Geo. P. Brown, principal high-school, Mrs. Geo. P. Brown, Jessie H. Brown, assistant-superintendent public schools, Prof. W. A. Bell, Prof. T. Charles, Hon. Byron K. Elliott, Geo. Merritt, Mrs. George Merritt, Wm. Coughlen, Jno. S. Newman, president Merchants National Bank, Col. James B. Black, Jos. E. Perry, Dr. E. S. Newcomer, Mrs. S. E. Newcomer, Col. Samuel Merrill, Franklin Taylor, Phebe M. Taylor, H. H. Lee, Mrs Elizabeth Lee, Dr. O. S. Runnels, Mrs. Dora C. Runnels, Horace McKay, Thomas E. Chandler, David Gibson, Miss Mary Bradshaw, Dr. J. C. Walker, Indianapolis; Elias Hicks Swayne, Mahala M. Swayne, Richmond; Dr. Geo. M. Dakin, Mrs. Geo. M. Dakin, Laporte.

Digitized by Google

W. Johnson, Mrs. J. H. Pickard; *Fillmore*, Charlotte Taeor, Margaret Ho
M. E. Molstad, Mrs. A. E. Harsh; *Fairbault*, Jane Harris, Georgia Adams
B. Thorp, Mrs. Levi Crump, Mrs. R. C. Smith, Mary Rumage, Mrs. L.
Goodhue, Mrs. H. A. Hobart; *Brown*, Mrs. O. B. Ingraham; *Douglass*, Mr
Lewis, Mrs. J. B. Van Hoesen, Mrs. Trask; *Houston*, Mrs. Annie M. C
Hennepin, Angelina Dupont, Mrs. M. F. Taylor; *Lyon*, Louise M. Ferro
Mrs. W. C. Robinson, Mertie Caley; *Mower*, Mrs. W. H. Parker, Mrs. V.
Mrs. J. F. Rockwell, Mrs. E. Hoppin, Sarah M. Dean; *Marshall*, Mrs. L.
Meeker, Mrs. A. R. Jackman, Mrs. Orin Whitney, Mary E. Ferguson; *Mar*
J. W. Fuller, Mrs. M. E. St. John, Mary E. Harvey, Mary A. McLean;
Adelle Moore, Jane Haggerty, Mrs. R. S. Carver; *Polk*, Mrs. M. C. Perrin
A. Barnum; *Ramsey*, Mrs. B. McGuire, Annie E. Dunn; *St. Louis*, Sara
Stearns; *Winona*, Dr. Adaline Williams; *Stevens* county reports one lady s
school-district treasurer; *Otter Tail* county reports six ladies serving in
places; *Wright* county, four serving as clerks of school-districts; and in *Beek*
it is said ladies sometimes serve as deputies during their husbands' absence.

[C.]

In a volume edited by Harriet N. R. Arnold, entitled, "The Poets and
Minnesota," published in 1864, are the following names: Mrs. Laura
Hunt, Mrs. Emily F. Bugbee Moore, Miss Eleanor C. Donnelly, Miss J
Fuller, Mrs. E. M. Harris, Miss Ninetta Maine, Mrs. J. R. McMasters, H
Bishop, Irene Galloway, Mary R. Lyon, Miss M. E. Pierson Smith, Mrs.
Pandergast, Julia A. A. Wood. Among the later writers possessing true poet
are Mrs. Julia Cooley Carruth, Miss Eva J. Stickney, Miss Jennie E. M. Ca
Emily Huntington Miller.

Among the authors who sent their books to the New Orleans Exposition
are Frances A. Shaw, Marion Shaw, Minnie May Lee, Eleanor G. Donnelly,
M. Sanford, Mrs. Julia Wood, Edna A. Barnard, Mrs. Arnold, Miss Franc
bett, Mrs. Henderson, Miss Campbell, Mrs. C. H. Plummer, Mrs. Will E.
Mrs. Delia Whitney Norton, Maria A. Drew, Mrs. Jennie Lynch, Miss
Cruikshank.

[D.]

Mrs. Winchell, wife of the president of the Minnesota State University, ki
us the names of the fifty-six young women who were graduated from that i
between 1875 and 1885: Class of '75, Helen Mar Ely; '76, Martha But
Matilda J. Campbell, Viola Fuller, Charlotte A. Rollet, Mary A. Maes;
Robinson, Nettie Getchel; '79, Marian H. Roe, Caroline Rollet, Martha
Evelyn May Champlin, Etta Medora Eliot; '80, Lizzie A. House, Bessie S. L
Minnie Reynolds, Lillian Todd, Cora Inez Brown; '81, Emily Hough, Dián
Sarah E. Palmer, Lilla Ruth Williams; '82, Carrie Holt, Lydia Holt, Ma
Holt, Alice E. Demmon, Louise Lillian Hilbourn, Emily D. McMillan,
Pillsbury, Agnes V. Bonniwell, Grace W. Curtis, Marie Louise Henry, Mar
Hughes, Carrie D. Fletcher; '83, Annie Harriet Jefferson, Kate Louise
Sarah Pierrepont McNair, Anna Calista Marston, Janet Nunn, Emma Franc
sell, Helen Louise Pierce, Martha Sheldon, Louise E. Hollister, Emma
'84, Hannah Sewall, Susie Sewall, Anna Bonfoy, Bessie Latho, Addie Ki
Belle Bradford, Emma Twinggi; '85, Mary Benton, Bertha Brown, Ida Mar
Irving, Mabel Smith.

Among the women who have been successful as preceptresses in the St
versity are: Helen Sutherland, M. A., Mrs. Augusta Norwood Smith, M
Campbell, B. L., Maria L. Sanford.

Among the teachers in the normal schools of the State are the following:

Winona—Martha Brechbill, Sophia L. Haight, Jennie Ellis, Sarah E. W

Digitized by Google

Kate L. Sprague, Vienna Dodge, Ada L. Mitchell, Anna C. Foekens, Rena M. Mead, Mary E. Couse, B. S.

Mankato Normal School—Helen M. Philips, Defransa A. Swan, Anna McCutcheon, Genevieve S. Hawley, Mary E. Hutcheson, Eliza A. Cheney, Charity A. Green, M. Adda Holton.

St. Cloud Normal School—Isabel Lawrence, Ada A. Warner, Minnie F. Wheelock, Rose A. Joclin, Mary L. Wright, Kittie W. Allen. Nearly all of the above-named teachers were graduated from Eastern colleges and universities.

Women occupy the same positions as men and receive corresponding salaries. A recent report of Minneapolis schools names fifteen women in the High School receiving from $650 to $900 per year; twelve principals of ward schools, receiving from $750 to $1,000; and eleven primary principals receiving from $650 to $800. At St. Paul there were reported two principals getting $1,200 each, two getting $900, and twelve others getting $600 each; of the five lady assistants in the High School, one received $900, one $800, and three received $700 each. The principal of the High School at Duluth receives $750 per annum, and some of the assistants and principals of ward schools, $600.

Miss Sarah E. Sprague, a graduate of St. Lawrence University, and of the Normal and Training School at Oswego, N. Y., has been employed since August, 1884, by the State Department of Public Instruction, for institute work, at a salary of $1,260 per year and expenses. Miss Sprague is a lady of rare ability and an honor to her profession.

Prominent among private schools for young ladies is the Bennett Seminary at Minneapolis, Mrs. B. B. Bennett, principal; also the Wasioja Seminary, Mrs. C. B. P. Lang, preceptress, and Miss M. V. Paine, instructor in music. The services of Miss Mary E. Hutcheson have been highly valued as instructor in vocal music and elocution in the Mankato Normal School. Miss Florence Barton at Minneapolis, Mrs. Emily Moore of Duluth, are excellent teachers of music, and Miss Zella D'Unger, of elocution.

Prominent among the kindergarten schools is that of Mrs. D. V. S. Brown at St. Paul; Mrs. Mary Dowse, Duluth; Miss Endora Hailman, Winona. The latter is director of the kindergarten connected with the Winona State Normal School. Miss Fannie Wood, Miss Kate E. Barry, Miss Ella P. McWhorter and Miss Abby E. Axtell, are reported as having rendered very efficient service as teachers in the State Deaf and Dumb Asylum; Miss Mary Kirk, Miss Alice Mott and Miss Emma L. Rohow are spoken of as having been earnest and devoted teachers in the State Institution for the Blind.

Mrs. Viola Fuller Miner of Minneapolis, graduated from the State University, has long been known as a teacher and writer of much ability. Her pen never touches the suffrage question except to its advantage. Miss Eloise Butler, teaching in the High School of the same city, would gladly have lent her personal aid to suffrage work had time and strength permitted. We have at least the blessing of her membership and influence. Mrs. Sadie Martin, likewise a teacher of advanced classes and an easy writer, will be remembered as the first president of the local suffrage society of Minneapolis, and one much devoted to its interests. Mrs. Maggie McDonald, formerly a teacher at Rochester and long a resident of St. Paul, has ever been a devoted friend of the suffrage cause—commenced work as long ago as '69, and is to-day unflagging in hope and zeal. Mrs. Caroline Nolte of the same city, though much occupied as a teacher in the High School, still found time to aid in forming the St. Paul Suffrage Society. Miss Helen M. McGowan, a teacher at Owatonna, is spoken of as "a grand woman who believes in the ballot as a means to higher ends." Miss S. A. Mayo, a lady of fine culture and a successful teacher of elocution, was also an active member of this society while in the city. Miss Clara M. Coleman, a classical scholar from Michigan University, for one year principal of the Duluth High School, was a believer in equal rights for all and did not hesitate to say so. Miss Louise Hollister, a graduate of the Minnesota University, is Miss Coleman's successor and a friend of

Digitized by Google

suffrage for women, with an educational qualification; she is vice-presider Equal Rights League of Duluth. Miss Jenny Lind Gowdy, graduated Winona Normal School, is an excellent primary principal who teaches her p girls should have the same rights and privileges as boys—no more, no less.

[E.]

The names of the women who have been admitted to the Minnesota State Society are: Clara E. Atkinson, Ida Clark, Mary G. Hood, A. M. Hunt, H Preston, Belle M. Walrath, Annes F. Wass, Lizzie R. Wass, Mary Twoddy W

Among the women who have practiced medicine in Minnesota are: (Underwood Jewell, Lake City; E. M. Roys, Rochester; Harriet E. Pre Mason, Mary E. Emery, Jennie Fuller, Clara E. Atkinson, St. Paul; Mary (Mary J. Twoddy Whetsone, R. C. Henderson, A. M. Hunt, Adele S. Hu Mary L. Swain, D. A. Coombe, Minneapolis; E. M. Roys, Mary Whitney Clark, Rochester; Augusta L. Rosenthal, Winona; Fannie E. Holden, Ann way Gray, Duluth.

The board of officers of the Sisters of Bethany has for many years cons *President*, Mrs. Charlotte O. Van Cleve; *Vice-President*, Mrs. Euphemia lock; *Secretary*, Mrs. Harriet G. Walker; *Treasurer*, Mrs. Abbie G. Mender

The city of Minneapolis takes the lead of all others in the State in the n its benevolent institutions. It has its Woman's Industrial Exchange, as business women; its Woman's Home, or pleasant boarding-house; for the ca women, its Northwestern Woman's Hospital and training-school for nurse homeopathic hospital for women; for the care of homeless infants, its Fo Home; for unfortunate girls, its Bethany Home. All of these institutions hands of the best of women. Among the most active are: Mrs. M. B. Le Abby Adair, Mrs. O. A. Pray, Mrs. J. M. Robinson, Mrs. John Edwards, Christian, Mrs. S. W. Farnham, Mrs. Wm. Harrison, Mrs. H. M. Carpent D. Morrison, Mrs. John Crosby, Mrs. George B. Wright, Mrs. Moses Marst Charlotte O. Van Cleve, Mrs. T. B. Walker, Dr. Mary S. Whetsone, M Winchell, Dr. Mary G. Hood, Mrs. R. W. Jordan, Miss A. M. Henderson.

In the city of Duluth there is a woman's home unlike any other in the Stat managed by a corporate body of ladies known as home missionaries. Th members are: Sarah B. Stearns, Laura Coppernell, Jennie C. Swanstrom, F Anthony, Olive Murphy, Flora Davey, Jennie S. Lloyd, Fannie E. Holde The work of this corporation is to seek out all poor women needing tempora and employment. The classes chiefly cared for are poor widows and desert and such small children as may belong to them; also over-worked young wo may need a temporary resting-place; also young girls thrown suddenly upon t resources without knowledge of how to care for themselves. These ladies for the unfortunate of another class, but in a retired place, unmarked by They prefer that to the usual plan of caring for the victims of men.

[F.]

Portrait and landscape-painters in oil and water-colors, who give promis cess: *Minneapolis*, Miss Clara V. Shaw, Miss Mary E. Neagle, Mrs Painter, Miss Mary Dunn, Mrs. Irene W. Clark, Miss C. M. Lenora, Mrs Clark, Mrs. A. M. West, Miss Myra H. Twitchell, Mrs. A. L. Loring, Mis Gurney, Mrs. Charles Fairfield, Mrs. A. T. Rand, Miss E. Robeson, Mis Goodwin, Mrs. Sarah E. Corbett, Mrs. Lucille Hunkle, Miss Mary Kenne Frances A. Pray. Mrs. W. B. Mead, Miss Flora Edwards, Mrs. Knight, M Mauley, Mrs. M. P. Hawkins; *St. Paul*, Miss Florence M. Cole, Miss M lingshead, Miss A. M. Shayre, Miss Alice Chandler, Mrs. Martha Griggs, M West, Mrs. Knox, Mrs. Theodosia Rose Cleveland, Mrs. Genevieve Jeffers

Digitized by Google

C. B. Grant, Jennie Lynch, Miss Wilson, Miss Lilla Inness, Mrs. George Eastman, Mrs. Paine, Mrs. Fannie Smith, Miss Alice Page, Mrs. Hunter; *Winona*, Mrs. W. Ely, Mrs. Ella Newell, Miss D. E. Barr; *Lake City*, Mrs. H. B. Sargent, Mrs. J. G. Richardson, Bessie Milliken; *Stillwater*, Sadie S. Clark, Miss Field, Sarah Murdock; *Albert Lea*, Birdie Slocum; *Fairbault*, Grace McKinster, Miss S. E. Cook; *Litchfield*, Mrs. Carter; *Alexandria*, Mamie Lewis; *St. Cloud*, Mary Clarke; *Fergus Falls*, Mrs. Wurtle; *Owatonna*, Mrs. D. O. Searles; *Duluth*, Emma F. Shaw Newcome, Anna E. Gilbert, Mrs. A. D. Frost, De Etta Evans, Mrs. Persis Norton, Addie W. L. Barrow, Gertrude Olmstead, Addie Hunter, Fanny Woodbridge. Doubtless there are many others of worth in other localities improving their talents and finding real enjoyment and pecuniary recompense in the pursuit of their loved art.

It is one of the imperfections of this chapter that the names cannot be given of the many gifted young ladies who have gone from Minnesota for a musical education to the New York and Boston Conservatories of Music. Of those who have gone from Duluth, and returned as proficients, may be named Mary Willis, Mary Ensign Hunter, Mary Munger, Florence Moore and Jessie Hopkins. With this beautiful thought in mind, "*noblesse oblige*," the christian workers of Duluth call upon these talented young ladies for aid in furnishing many entertainments for charity's sake, and are seldom disappointed.

[G.]

Among the occasional speakers and writers not mentioned in the main chapter are: Abbie J. Spaulding, Mrs. M. M. Elliot, Miss A. M. Henderson, Mrs. M. J. Warner, Lizzie Manson, Rebecca S. Smith, Viola Fuller Miner, Harriet G. Walker, Eliza Burt Gamble, Emma Harriman, Eva McIntyre, Mary Hall Dubois, Minnie Reed, Mrs. G. H. Miller, Dr. Mary Whetsone, Mrs. M. C. Ladd, Mrs. M. A. Seely, Mrs. E. S. Wright, Mrs. M. H. Drew, Mrs. E. J. Holly, Mrs. David Sanford, Mrs. F. E. Russell, Lily Long. Zoe McClary, daughter of Rev. and Mrs. Thomas McClary, gives promise of distinction.

Since the formation of the State and local societies there are many women in their quiet homes who are ever ready to encourage any effort toward making all women more free, helpful and happy. Let this paragraph record the names of a few of these: Mary E. Chute, Isabelle L. Blaisdell, Mary Partridge, Mrs. C. C. Curtis, Frances A. Shaw, Lucy E. Prescott, Mrs. S. J. Squires, Minnie Reed, Mrs. E. S. Wright, Nellie H. Hazeltine, Adelle J. Grow, Mrs. A. B. Cole, Mrs. A. F. Bliss, Mrs. E. J. Holley, Frances P. Sawyer, Frances L. James, Mrs. M. C. Clark, Lucy Gibbs, Prudence Lusk, Lizzie P. Hawkins, M. Hammond, Mrs. E. Southworth, Josephine Strait, Kittie Manson, Mrs. R. C. Watson, Alice B. Cash, Emma Drew, Helen M. Olds, Mrs. W. W. Bilson, Adaline Smith, Mrs. L. A. Watts, Emily Moore, Olive Murphy, Mrs. L. A. Wentworth, Gertrude L. Gow, Della W. Norton, Mrs. V. A. Wright, Mrs. M. H. Wells, Aurelia Bassett, Kate C. Stevens, Mary Vrouman, Belle Hazen, Mrs. D. C. Hunt, Mrs. L. H. Young, Louisa Stevens, Esther Hayes, Sarah J. Crawford, Lucinda Roberts, Carrie Rawson, Sarah Herrick, Kate Tabor, Charlotte Herbert, Belle McClelland, Jane E. Knott, Margaret Bryson, Mary McKnight, Emma Coleman, Sarah Ricker, Mary M. Pomeroy, Sarah Pribble, Mary A. Grinnell, Eliza Van Ambden.

CHAPTER LIII.

CALIFORNIA.

We give not only the names of the delegates present at the convention of 1870, but also of a few of the most earnest friends of the cause in the several counties of the State, not heretofore mentioned in connection with the early conventions.

In San Francisco we must not omit the venerable Eliza Taylor, a sweet-faced Quaker, eighty years of age, nor Fanny Green McDougall—"Aunt" Fanny, as

Digitized by Google

we loved to call her—nor Mrs. C. C. Calhoun, Mary F. Snow, Minnie Edwards, Mrs. O. Fuller, Mrs. C. M. Parker, Wm. R. Ryder, Mrs. M. J. Hendee, Kate Collins, Mary Kellogg, Louise Fowler, M. J. Hemsley and Mrs. H. T. Perry. In October, 1883, Elizabeth McComb, Mary Coggins, Mrs. J. V. Drinkhouse, Dr. and Mrs. E. D. Smith, Mrs. E. Sloan, Mrs. C. J. Furman, Elizabeth D. Layres, Miss Prince, Kate Kennedy, Carrie Parker, Marion Hill,* Mrs. Olmstead, Mrs. Dr. White, Dr. Laura P. Williams and Mrs. Olive Washburn were all members of the city and State associations. There was the brilliant Sallie Hart, who took such an active part in the "local option" contest in 1871, and who as a newspaper reporter and correspondent in the State legislature for two or three sessions was very active in urging the claims of woman upon the consideration of our law-makers.

Hon. Philip A. Roach, often a prominent official of the State, and for many years editor of the *Daily Examiner*, is an advocate of woman's rights and was instrumental in getting an act, known as "Senator Roach's bill to Punish Wife-whippers," passed. It provided that such offenders should be punished by flogging upon the bare back at the whipping-post. A wise and just law, but it was afterward declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Hon. James G. Maguire, a brilliant and rising young lawyer, a member of the legislature in 1875, now a judge of the Superior Court of San Francisco, is a most reliable and talented advocate of equality for women. Among the members of the bar and other prominent men of the State are to be found a number who are either pronounced in their views of woman's right to vote, or are inclined to favor all measures tending to ameliorate woman's condition in life; of whom are Judge G. M. Clough, Judge Darwin, D. J. Murphy, Judge L. Quint, Col. J. P. Jackson of the *Daily Post*, Hon. Charles Gildea of the Board of Equalization, Judge Toohey, the late Judge Charles Wolff, Rev. Dr. F. F. Jewell, Dr. R. H. McDonald, the prominent temperance advocate; Hon. J. T. Wharton, P. S. Dorney, esq., Judge J. B. Lamar, Rev. Dr. Robert McKenzie, Capt. Walker of the *City Argus*, Hon. Frank Pixley of the *Argonaut*, ex-Gov. James A. Johnson of the *Daily Alta*, Alfred Cridge, esq., Dr. R. B. Murphy, N. Hawks, W. H. Barnes of *The Call*, O. Dearing, Hon. W. W. Marrow, Hon. Charles A. Sumner, representative in congress; Hon. J. B. Webster of the *California Patron*, in San Francisco. In other parts of the State are; Senator Cross of Nevada county, Assemblyman Cominette of Amador, Judge G. G. Clough, and Senator Kellogg of Plumas county, Hon. H. M. Larue, Speaker of the House, and Assemblyman Doty of Sacramento county, Senator Del Valle of Los Angeles, Hon. O. B. Hitchcock of Tulare county, Judge McCannaughy and Judge E. Steele of Siskyon county, Hon. T. B. Wigginton, Judge Charles Marks, R. J. Steele, esq., of Merced county; John Mitchell, John T. Davis and Capt. Gray of Stanislaus; Hon. J. McM. Shafter of Marin county; Senator Brooks and Judge J. D. Hinds of Ventura county.

Sacramento county contains a large number of progressive men and women, though the good work has consisted mainly in the efforts made by committees appointed by the State society to attend the biennial sessions of the legislatuere, most of whom were not residents of the county. But among those who have done good service in Sacramento, the first and most active for many years has been Mrs. L. G. Waterhouse, now of Monterey. She espoused the cause in early life, and when many added years compelled her to retire from active service, her efforts in behalf of women were still continued. Miss Dr. Kellogg is not only a successful practitioner of medicine, but is gifted with eloquent speech, and has on several occasions addressed the legislature of the State; Dr. Jennie Bearby, for some years a resident of Sacramento, now of Idaho, is worthy of mention; Mrs. M. J. Young, attorney-at-law since June, 1879; Annie G. Cummings and daughter, have been among the earliest and most faithful adherents to our cause. Mrs. E. B. Crocker has, through her social position, exerted great influence in a quiet way, and has contributed liberally from her vast wealth to aid the

* Mrs. Hill was President of the San Francisco Woman Suffrage Society for three years prior to her death in 1884.

Digitized by Google

cause; she founded the Marguerite Home for aged women. Dr. and Mrs. Bowman, now of Oakland, were pioneers in this work; while Mesdames Jackson, Hontoon, Perley Watson, and Miss Hattie Moore are among the recent converts. Hon. Grove L. Johnson has been one of the most eloquent of all the fearless champions of women who have occupied a seat in the legislature; Hon. Creed Haymond deserves to rank with the foremost, as an able advocate of woman's political rights; Hon. S. J. Finney of Santa Cruz, Talbot Wallis, State Librarian, Judge Taylor, a prominent lawyer, and his brilliant wife, are also among our friends. Sarah A. Montgomery, Mattie A. Shaw, Mrs. A. Wilcox, Mary B. Lewis, Judge and Mrs. McFarland, Judge J. W. Armstrong, encouraged by his devoted and talented wife, and a large number of others, favor in a quiet way the ballot for women.

San Joaquin county has been the home of Laura De Force Gordon since 1870, and much of her practice as a lawyer has been in the courts at Stockton. Among the earliest advocates of suffrage were Mr. and Mrs. William Condy, Mr. and Mrs. Harry, Judge Brush, Hattie Brush, Judge Roysdon, William Hickman and wife, Mrs. E. Emery, William Israel, Hannah Israel, Miss E. Clifford, Dr. Holden, Richard Condy and his noble wife Elizabeth, who was the first president of the San Joaquin county society. Among a host of others are Mr. and Mrs. W. F. Freeman and their bright young daughter Sophronia, who gives promise of future usefulness in the lecture-field; Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Gage, whose daughter Hattie possesses marked artistic ability, and though still in her teens has produced oil paintings of rare beauty; Dr. Brown, physician in charge of the State Insane Asylum; Dr. Phœbe Tabor, for many years a successful medical practitioner; Mrs. N. G. Cary, Mrs. M. S. Webb, Mrs. Zignago, a successful business woman; Mr. and Mrs. H. B. Loomis, R. B. Lane, Mr. and Mrs. H. M. Bond, and Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Overhiser, both of whom are active members of that liberal woman's rights order, the Patrons of Husbandry. Hon. R. C. Sargent, a member of the legislature for several terms, has always aided the woman's cause by his vote and influence. Dr. J. L. Sargent and his intelligent wife are also friends to every measure tending to benefit woman. Hon. S. L. Terry, Senator F. T. Baldwin, James A. Lontitt, esq., Judge J. H. Budd, Judge A. Van R. Patterson, George B. McStay, Judge Buckley and a number of other prominent officials and members of the legal profession, are all in favor of equal rights.

Sonoma county has a few fearless friends of woman suffrage. Mary Jewett, Mrs. Prince, Fannie M. Wertz and Miss E. Merrill were officers in the first organization formed at Healdsburg in that county in 1870, and together with J. G. Howell and wife, who were proprietors of the *Russian River Flag*, kept up the society for years. At Petaluma, Mrs. A. A. Haskell, Mr. and Mrs. A. L. Hatch, Kate Lovejoy and Mrs. Judge Latimer organized a society in 1869. In Solano county are Mr. and Mrs. Denio and Mrs. E. L. Hale of Vallejo; Mrs. Elizabeth Ober and Mrs. Celia Geddes of Fairfield. Napa county soon became an objective point for lecturers; a society was organized at St. Helena in 1871, with Mr. and Mrs. John Lewellyn, Charles King, Mrs. Potter and Dr. and Mrs. Allyn as officers; at Napa were Joseph Eggleton and wife and Mrs. Ellis. In San Mateo county was Mrs. Dr. Kilpatrick. Contra Costa county was organized in 1870, and Mrs. Phebe Benedict, Mrs. Abbott, Mary O'Brien, Sarah Sellers, Dr. and Mrs. Howard, Hannah Israel, an able writer and lecturer, and Capt. Kimball of Antioch, took an active part therein. Mrs. J. H. Chase of Martinez, E. H. Cox and wife of Danville, were pioneers in the cause, and Henry and Abigail Bush of Martinez, were most prominent in the first meetings held there. Mrs. Bush had the honor to preside over the second woman suffrage convention ever held in the United States, that at Rochester, N. Y., in 1848. O. Alley and wife, also of Martinez, extended their hospitality to lecturers who visited that place, and fully sympathized in the cause.

In Marin county a society was formed in 1870, with Isabella Irwin, Mrs. Barney, Flora Whitney, Mrs. M. Dubois and Mary Battey Smith, as officers; Mrs. McM. Shafter, a gifted and influential lady, was also an active worker in the good cause. Alameda county—Rev. John Benton and wife, Professor E. Carr and wife, Mrs. C. C.

Digitized by Google

Calhoun, Mrs. M. L. S. Duncan, Mrs. S. S. Allen, Dr. and Mrs. Powers, Mr. and Mrs. Ingersoll, Angie Eager, Mary Kenny, George and Martha Parry and Mr. and Mrs. William Stevens, were interested in the earlier agitation of the question; Mrs. Sanford, Mrs. A. M. Stoddard and Mrs. M. Johnson are among the later converts. Merced county the home of Rowena Granice Steele, the author, and publisher of the *San Joaquin Valley Argus*, has furnished the State with a worthy and capable advocate of woman suffrage, both as a speaker and writer. In her cozy, rose-embowered cottage at Merced, she generously entertains her numerous guests, who always seek out this distinguished and warm-hearted friend of woman. Stanislaus county is the present home of Jennie Phelps Purvis, a talented and brilliant woman, well known in literary circles in an early day and for some years a prominent officer and member of the State society. At Modesto are Mrs. Lapham and daughter Amel, and Mr. and Mrs. Brown, good friends to suffrage. In San Diego are Mrs. F. P. Kingsbury, Mrs. Tallant. In Santa Cruz county, Georgiana Bruce Kirby, Mrs. H. M. Blackburn, Mrs. M. E. Heacock, Rev. D. G. Ingraham, Ellen Van Valkenburg. In Los Angeles county, Mrs. Eliza J. Hall, M. D. Ingo county, J. A. Jennings. Santa Clara county, J. J. Owen, the able editor of the *San José Mercury;* Laura J. Watkins, Hon. O. H. Smith and wife, Mrs. G. B. McKee, Mrs. McFarland, Mrs. Herman, Mrs. Montgomery, Mrs. Miller, Mrs. J. J. Crawford, Mrs. R. B. Hall, Mrs. Knox, Mrs. Wallis, Mrs. C. M. Putney, Mrs. Damon, Miss Walsh, and many others, have all helped the good cause in San José; while Louisa Smith of Santa Clara, a lady of advancing years, was ever a faithful friend of the cause, as was also Miss Emma S. Sleeper of Mountain View, formerly of Mt. Morris, N. Y. In Nevada county, originally the home of Senator A. A. Sargent, the question of woman suffrage was agitated at an early day. The most active friends were: Ellen Clark Sargent, Emily Rolfe, Mrs. Leavett, Mrs. E. P. Keeney, Mrs. E. Loyed, Elmira Eddy, Mr. and Mrs. William Stevens, Mrs Hanson, Judge Palmer and Mrs. Cynthia Palmer.

CHAPTER LVI.

GREAT BRITAIN.

A CRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF THE SUCCESSIVE STEPS OF PROGRESS TOWARDS FREEDOM FOR WOMEN.

1848. Queen's College, Harley street, London, founded for girls.
1849. Bedford College, London, founded; incorporated, 1869.
1850. North London Collegiate School for girls opened by Miss Buss, April 4.
1854. Cheltenham Ladies' College commenced....Miss Nightingale goes to Sentari; from hence may be dated the beginning of training schools for nurses, metropolitan associations for nursing the poor, etc., etc.
1856. Female Artists' Society founded.
1857. Divorce and Matrimonial Causes act passed, by which divorce and judicial separation became attainable in course of law....Ladies' Sanitary Association, founded October 1.
1858. *Englishwoman's Journal* started (now *Englishwoman's Review*) by Bessie R. Parkes and Mdme. Bodichon, March 2....First swimming bath for ladies, opened in Marylebone, July 14.
1859. Society for the Employment of Women established in London, June 22.
1860. Law-copying Office for women opened February 15....Victoria Printing Press, established March 26....Institution for the Employment of Needle-women commenced....First admission of women students to the Royal Academy (Miss Herford).
1861. Lectures on Physiology to ladies at University College, April.

1862. Social Science Congress in London; though not the first time ladies had read papers at the congress—this was remarkable for the increased share they took in its proceedings....Ladies' Negro Emancipation Society commenced.... New church order of deaconeeses founded on the model of Kaiserwerth.... First voyage of Miss Rye to Australia, and commencement of her system of emigration.

1863. Establishment of Queen's Institute, Dublin, for industrial training of women.

1864. Female Medical and Obstetrical Society begun....Working Women's College, Queen's Square, opened October 26.

1865. Miss Garrett receives her medical diploma from Apothecaries' Hall.

1866. A petition of 1,500 women for the franchise presented, and the first women's suffrage society formed.

1867. Mr. Mill's motion in the House of Commons to give the suffrage to women.... Lily Maxwell voted in Manchester for Mr. Jacob Bright.

1868. In the general election many women who were left on the register voted. Women's suffrage was declared illegal by the Court of Common Pleas, November 9....London University establishes a women's examination.

1869. Ladies' Educational Association begun in London, which was dissolved July 18, 1878, upon London University College admitting women as regular students....Women's College established at Hitchin, October....The telegraph service was transferred to government, and women clerks were retained, thus entering the civil service....Municipal Franchise act passed; women first voted under it November 1.

1870. Publication of *Women's Suffrage Journal* commenced March 1....Women's Disabilities Removal bill introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright, M. P., read a second time, but rejected in committee, May....Lectures for women begun in Cambridge....First examinations of women in Queen's University, Ireland....Married Women's Property act (England) passed, August 9.... National Indian Association established by Mary Carpenter (principal object: the improvement of women's education in India), September....Vigilance Association established, October; mainly occupied in women's questions.... Elementary Education act passed....First school-board election in London, November 25 (Miss Garrett and Miss Emily Davies elected in London; Miss Becker, Manchester, etc.).

1871. Ladies' National Health Association commenced by Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell.... Law of Ireland amended slightly with regard to married women's property.... National Union for improving the education of women established by Mrs. Grey, November.

1872. New Hospital for Women, opened February, in Marylebone (women doctors) ....Girls' Public Day School Company formed. First school opened January 1, at Chelsea; there are now fifteen....Girton College, Cambridge, incorporated. Hitchin College subsequently removed to it....New Bastardy act, passed August 10, affording a greater measure of relief to unmarried mothers.

1873. Mrs. Nassau Senior, appointed assistant inspector of workhouses, January; the first government appointment of a lady; made permanent, February, 1874. ....First school-board election in Scotland, February (twenty ladies elected). ....Second English school-board....Custody of Infants act passed, which enables a man, having a deed of separation from his wife, to give up the custody of the children to her if he chooses.

1874. Women's Peace and Arbitration Auxiliary of the London Peace Society formed, April....Women's Protection and Provident League formed, July 8 (benefit societies and trades unions for working women)....Protection Orders given to wives in Scotland, July 19....College for Working Women, Fitzroy street, London, opened October....London School of Medicine for Women, opened October 12.

Digitized by Google

1875. A lady first elected as poor-law guardian (Miss Merington, in Kensington), April....Albemarle Club opened for ladies and gentlemen, May 29...Newnham College, Cambridge, opened....Employment of Women Office, opened in Brighton....Female clerkships in Post-Office Savings Bank....Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland admitted women to examinations....Madras Medical School opened to women....First woman lawyer's office opened in London (Miss Orme)....Metropolitan and National Nursing Association formed....Women delegates from women's unions first admitted to Trades' Congress in Glasgow, October.

1876. Admission of women to Manchester New College, February 9....First qualified woman pharmacist established in London (Miss Isabella Clarke)....Plan-tracing office for women opened (Miss Crosbie)....Employment of Women Office, opened in Glasgow....Scholarship for women established in Bristol University College....British Women's Temperance Association commenced ....Passing of the act, known as Russell-Gurney's act, enabling universities to admit women to degrees, August....Resolutions of King and Queen's College of Physicians in Ireland to confer medical degrees on women; five ladies passed their examinations and received degrees in the following spring ....A memorial, signed by 45,000 women, presented to the queen on behalf of the Bulgarians.

1877. Teachers, Training and Registration Society inaugurated, February 2....Trinity College, London, decided to throw open its musicial examinations to women. ....St. Andrew's University offered "Literate in Arts" degrees to women. ....A bill to amend the Married Women's Property Law (Scotland) passed; came into force January 1, 1878....International Congress on Public Morality met at Geneva, September....Admission of women medical students to the Royal Free Hospital, October 1....Manchester and Salford College for women (now affiliated to the Victoria University) opened, October.

1878. Society to extend the knowledge of law among women started....Matrimonial Causes Amendment act passed; a clause being inserted by Lord Penzance enabling magistrates to grant a judicial separation to women if brutally treated by their husbands, a maintenance to be given them, and the children to remain under their mother's care....Admission of women to London University degrees and examinations, July 1....Intermediate Education act, Ireland; participation of girls in its benefits.

1879. Victoria University charter grants degrees to women....Oxford, Somerville and Lady Margaret Halls opened, October....Nine ladies elected on London school-board, November....Pharmaceutical Society admits women as members, October....Order of St. Katherine for nurses established....School for wood-engraving and one for wood-carving established.

1880. Charter of Irish University gives degrees to women....Demonstration of women in Manchester in favor of the suffrage, February 3: followed by London, Bristol and Nottingham in the same year....Bill to give further protection to little girls under 13 passed....Mason College in Birmingham founded; equal facilities to girls and boys....First lady B. A. in London University, October....Melbourne University matriculates women, March 22....The Burial bill gives women the right to conduct funeral services.... The House of Keys in the Isle of Man passed women's suffrage for women who are owners of property, November 5.

1881. Suffrage bill in the Isle of Man received royal assent January 5; seven hundred women are electors; general election began March 21....Cambridge University admits women students to formal examinations by a vote of 398 against 32, February 24....Durham University votes that women may become members.

1881. Sydney University (New South Wales) admits women to matriculation and degrees....New Zealand University confers title of M. A. on a woman, August

Digitized by Google

....Poor-law Guardian Association for promoting the election of ladies established, March; seven ladies elected in London....Somerville Club for women opened....Women clerks admitted to the civil service by open competition....Municipal Franchise act for Scotland, passed June 3; came into operation January 1, 1882....Married Women's Property act for Scotland, passed July 18.

1882. London University Convocation resolves to admit women as graduates, January 17....Twelve women elected in London as poor-law guardians, April; fifteen in the country....Married Women's Property act passed by the Lords and brought down to the Commons May 22; passed and returned to the Lords August 16; received royal assent August 18....Addition to Municipal Franchise act (Scotland) by inclusion of police burghs....Women first voted in Scotland under the new act, November 8....Appointment of women as registrars of births and deaths in four parishes.

1883. Married Women's Property act comes into operation January 1....Appointment of Miss E. Shove as physician to female staff in post-office; first appointment by government of a woman....Poor-law guardian elections, April; thirteen ladies in London, two in Scotland for the first time; thirteen in other towns in England....Mr. Stansfeld's resolution against the Contagious Diseases acts carried in the House of Commons by a majority of 72, April 26; the acts consequently are suspended....May.—Memorial to the Prime Minister signed by 110 independent Liberal members, asking that women's suffrage shall be included in the coming Reform bill....Mr. Mason's resolution for women's suffrage thrown out by a majority of only 16....Great conference of Liberal associations at Leeds on parliamentary reform votes for woman suffrage, October 17, followed by similar votes at Edinburgh, November 16; Manchester, November 21; Bristol, November 26, and in many smaller places....Guarantee-fund raised in Bombay for lady physicians and hospitals for women commenced; Calcutta University opened to women.

1884. Second reading of the bill for the Custody and Guardianship of children carried, March 26, by a majority of 134....First lady, Mrs. Bryant, obtained degree of Doctor of Science in London University....Nine ladies obtain B. A. degree in Royal Irish University.

1885. College of Surgeons, Ireland, opens its degrees to women....Criminal-law Amendment Bill passed in August, raising the age of protection for girls, and giving increased facilities for rescuing them from ruin....Municipal suffrage granted to women in Madras....Miss Mason appointed inspector of workhouses by local government board, November.

Digitized by Google

INDEX

TO

THE HISTORY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Compiled by JOHN WEINHEIMER of *The New York Tribune.*

A.

Abelard, i, 759.
Abbott, Francis, iii, 127.
Adam and Eve, i, 561.
Adams, Abigail Smith, i, 32, 201.
Adams, Hannah, author, i, 205.
Adams, John, i, 31, iii, 79.
Adams, John Q., iii, 479.
Adams, Mary N., lecturer, iii, 614.
Addresses and appeals, i, 106, 595, 676, 742, 856; ii, 51, 67, 167, 168, 364, 485, 517; iii, 58, 129, 580.
Adelbert College, iii, 498.
Agitator, ii, 373, iii, 274.
Agrippa, Cornelius, i, 29.
Alabama, iii, 830.
Albany Evening Journal, ii, 282.
Albany Knickerbocker on woman's rights, i, 611.
Albany Register on woman's rights, i, 608, 609, 610, 611.
Albany Law Journal, ii, 691, 947.—on "our laws," iii, 94.
Alcibiades and the dog, ii, 103.
Alcott, A. Bronson, iii, 193—on woman suffrage, iii, 519.
Alcott, Abby May, appeal, i, 247.
Alcott, Louisa May, letter to Mrs. Stone, ii, 831.
Alexander, Janet, iii, 298.
Allen, Jane, case of, ii, 592.
Allen, Nancy R., argument before Senate Committee, iii, 160—legacy, iii, 624—Notary Public, made, iii, 626.
Allen, Sophia Ober, iii, 502.
Almanac, Woman's Rights, i, 863.
Amberly, Lady, letter to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 439.
AMERICAN EQUAL RIGHTS ASSOCIATION: —"colored," the word, discussion, ii, 214—Constitution, ii, 173—Meetings: Academy of Music (Brooklyn), ii, 398, Church of the Puritans, ii, 182, Cooper Institute, ii, 309, Steinway Hall, ii, 378—Memorial to Congress, ii, 226—name changed to "Nat. Woman Suffrage Association," ii, 400—officers, ii, 174—organized, ii, 173—letter of B. F. Wade, ii, 117—report, Susan B. Anthony's, ii, 183.
American flag, design, i, 323.
AMERICAN WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION, ii, 756—Celebration of Woman Suffrage in New Jersey, ii, 846—constitution of, ii, 763—conventions: call for first, ii, 757, Baltimore, 820, Brooklyn in Plymouth Church, 831, Cincinnati, O., 854, Cleveland, O., 802, Detroit, Mich., 834, Indianapolis, Ind., 851, Louisville, Ky., 861, New York City in Apollo Hall, 821, in Cooper Institute, 825, in Steinway Hall, 809, 840, Philadelphia, 815, 849, St. Louis, Mo., 821, Washington, D. C., 819, 858—letter, circular, ii, 757—members received at the White House by Mrs. Hayes, ii., 860—memorial to Congress, ii., 859, referred to Committee on Territories, 860—report of chairman of Executive Committee, ii, 803—resolutions, ii, 805, 809, 810, 818, 826, 837, 843, 849, 851, 859.
Ames, Chas. G., i, 271, ii, 844, iii, 754.
Amnesty, universal, ii, 315.
Amos, Sheldon, on vice, i, 796.
Anderson, Geo. W., iii, 699.
Andrews, Margaret H., letter to S. J. May, i, 531.
Angell, John W., iii, 341.
Ann Arbor University, ii, 541.
Annekè, Franceska, i, 571, ii, 374, 393—sketch of iii, 646.
Anniversaries, *See Conventions.*
Anthony, Daniel, Lucy and Mary, i, 461.
Anthony, Hon, Henry B., on woman suffrage, i, 867, ii, 106, 273—Pembina Territory bill, on the, ii, 568—Sargent's amendment to the Pembina Territory bill, on, *ib.*—suffrage on, iii, 339—woman suffrage, his last utterance on, iii, 350.
ANTHONY, Susan B., i, 186, 465, 467,

Digitized by Google

468, 476, 485, 487, 489, 490, 500, 501, 515, 517, 526, 570, 589, 591, 607, 624, 653, 673, 679, 716; ii, 66, 67, 116, 154, 220, 286, 287, 322, 360, 361, 363, 375, 382, 389, 391, 427, 431, 437, 442, 456, 582, 584, 760; iii, 3, 40, 66, 151, 175, 178, 195, 243, 257, 412, 502, 560, 580, 630, 641, 697, 773, 811, 819—Abolitionists, and the, ii, 264—American Equal Rights Association, ii, 117, 171—appeal for woman rights, 1854, i, 856—appeal to Congress, ii, 167—argument before Illinois Legislature, iii, 572—argument before Senate Committee, iii, 160, 227—arrest of, ii, 628—arrest, incidents of, ii, 539—arrest, resolution concerning, ii, 537—birthday celebrated in Indianapolis, iii, 538—"Bloomer," in a, i, 128—bonnet and Noah's ark, iii, 522—"Bread and Ballot," iii, 536—California visit, iii, 756—call, loyal women, ii, 53—Centennial Exhibition, at the, iii 27—complimented by Judge Edmunds, iii, 160—Constitutional Convention at Albany, before, ii, 284—corruptionist, as a, ii, 936—Declaration of Rights, reads, at Centennial, iii, 31—delegate to Democratic National Convention, ii, 340, comments of the press, ii, 342—Democratic National Convention, at the, iii, 182—*feme sole* capable of making a contract, iii, 21—Fifteenth Amendment, on the, ii, 340—financial report, ii, 175—fugitive wife's escape from an insane asylum, aids, i, 469—general agent, appointed, i, 619—Grant and Wilson campaign, appeal, ii, 517—Grant, U. S., conversation with, ii, 544—Iowa, in, iii, 622—Kansas campaign, i, 200, ii, 239, 254, 261, 262, 263—lecture, "False Theory," iii, 675—lecturing tour, Ohio, iii, 491—Letters: Boston Convention, i, 256—Brooks, James, to, ii, 97—Carson League, i, 488—Democratic National Convention, to, ii, 340—Foote, E. B., to, ii, 941—Garfield, Jas. A., to, iii, 185—loyal women, from, ii, 875—Mott, Lydia, to, i, 748—Stanton, Mrs., to, announcing her having voted, ii, 934—Wright, Martha C., to, i, 678. Logan, Olive, and, ii, 385—"Male" in the Constitution, on the word, ii, 91—manhood suffrage, on, iii, 566—marriage and divorce, on, i, 735—meeting in Rahway, N. J., iii, 479—meetings in Virginia, iii, 824—Michigan campaign, iii, 522—Napoleon of Woman Suffrage, the, i, 456—Newport Convention, ii, 403—on Mrs. Robert Dale Owen, i, 303—Oregon visit, iii, 769—police officer, and the, ii, 540—portrait, i, 577—President Mozart Hall Convention, i, 668—President National Woman Suffrage Association, ii, 516—presentations, iii, 193—reception, Sorosis, iii, 571—registered, ii, 627—reminiscences, Mrs. E. C. Stanton's, i, 456—report, National Convention, at Cooper Institute, i, 689—report as secretary of American Equal Rights Association, ii, 183—*Revolution*, i, 46—Secretary Loyal League, made, ii, 66—sex, and her, ii, 112—Speeches: Anti-Slavery question, ii, 898—Congressional Committee, before, ii, 414, 513—first public speech, i, 41—Furness' Church, in iii, 35—Is It a Crime for a United States' Citizen to Vote? ii, 630—Philadelphia Convention, i, 385—Saratoga Convention, i, 621—Teachers' Convention, N. Y. State, i, 513—Temperance Convention, Rochester, i, 483—Washington Convention, ii, 423, 521—Washington Convention, iii, 259—Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 57, 61. Suffrage, on, ii, 383—tableau "Mother and Susan," i, 461—Taxation without Representation, on, ii, 539—Temperance Convention at Rochester, read call, i, 481—testimonial, i, 534—tour, western, ii, 367—tour with Ernestine L. Rose, i, 97—tracts, Kansas campaign, ii, 239—tracts and petitions, on, i, 383—Train, G. F., and *The Revolution*, criticism, ii, 264—Trial: Arrest, ii, 628—argument, Crowley's, ii, 648, 675—argument, Judge Selden's, ii, 654—bail, refused to give, ii, 629—case opened by Judge Selden, ii, 652—Gage, Matilda J., Letter to *Albany Law Journal*, ii, 947—guilty, Court directs a verdict of, ii, 679—Hunt's, Judge, decision, ii, 677—Hunt's decision criticised, ii, 689,—Hunt's decision reviewed, ii, 946—incidents, ii, 537—indictment, ii, 647—inspectors of elections, *See trials and decisions*—Jones, B. W., testimony, ii, 650—letter from Gerrit Smith, ii, 941—trial, new, denied, ii, 687—trial, new, motion for, ii, 680—opening of, ii, 647—petition to Congress praying for remission of fine, ii, 698—reports, majority and minority, ii, 701, 711—Pound, J. E., testimony ii, 653—press comments, ii, 935—resolutions concerning, ii, 537—Selden's letter, ii, 935—sentenced to pay a fine of $100, ii, 687—testimony in trial of election inspectors, ii, 692—Washington gossip, ii, 943. Tribute, "Aunt Lottie's," iii, 41—tribute, to Laura C. Haviland, iii, 532—tribute, from *The Leavenworth Commercial* (Kansas), ii, 263—tribute to Lucretia Mott, iii, 189—tribute, St. Louis Convention, iii, 147—tribute, Scovill's, ii, 420—visit to Lucretia Mott, i, 414—voted for

Digitized by Google

Grant for President, ii, 628—letter announcing her having voted, ii, 934—Washington Territory Legislature, hearing before, iii, 786—Wyoming visit, iii, 734.
Anti-Slavery struggle, i, 39, 52, 54, 323, 325, 339, 417—Josephine Griffing and Freedman's Bureau, ii, 29—Society reorganized, ii, 153.
Anti-Woman Suffrage Society, iii, 99.
Antonelli's, Cardinal, sacrilegious child, i, 788.
Appendix, i, 801, ii, 863, iii, 955.
Archer, Stevenson, iii, 816.
Arkansas, iii, 805—Constitutional Convention, iii, 806.
Arnell's services in Congress, ii, 489, 491.
Arnett, Hannah, i, 442.
Art and artists, iii, 301.
Ashley, Henry, iii, 319.
Ashley, J. M., speech in Congress, iii, 495.
Astell, Mary, i, 30.
Attorneys, ii, 604.
Augustine, i, 756.
Austin, Helen V., sketch of, i, 312.
Austria, iii, 904.
Autograph book, Centennial, iii, 40.
Avery, Alida C., iii, 719.

B.

Ballard, Anna, iii, 407.
Ballot, the, ii, 168—Sumner on the, ii, 95—what is the, ii, 155.
Ballot-Box, iii, 51, 504.
Banks, N. P., speech, iii, 10.
Banquet, St. James Hotel, ii, 441.
Bar, admission to the, iii, 330.
Barber, Miss, i, 807.
Barkaloo, Helena, lawyer, iii, 404.
Barker, Jos., i, 114—Pulpit, on the, i, 140.
Barnum, P. T., i, 503.
Barstow, Hon. A. C., i, 499—battle-field, services on the, ii, 23—letters to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 916.
Barton, Clara, appeal to soldier friends, ii, 418.
Bascom, Emma C., letter to S. B. Anthony, iii, 647.
Batchelder, Mrs. Dr. L. S., on working women, ii, 389.
"Battle Hymn of the Republic," ii, 18.
Battle of Lexington, commemoration of, iii, 414.
Baxter, Richard, on witchcraft, i, 765.
Bayard, Thos. F., ii, 567, 576; iii, 205-6.
Beck, Senator, on woman suffrage, iii, 209.
Becker, Lydia E., letters, iii, 62, 121, 249.
Beecher, Catharine E., ii, 787, iii, 399.
Beecher, Edward, ii, 368, iii, 566.
BEECHER, Henry Ward, Kansas campaign, ii, 265—letter to American Woman Suffrage Association meeting in St. Louis, ii, 825—letter to Lucy Stone, Presidency American Woman Suffrage Association, ii, 808—letter to Washington Convention, ii, 496—President of American Woman Suffrage Association, made, ii, 764—speeches, ii, 156, 216, 399, 766, 774; iii, 52—suffrage, universal, and, ii, 315—Tilton colloquy, ii, 167—Tilton trial, i, 789—woman's right to vote, on, i, 620.
Beecher, Lyman, i, 393.
Belgium, iii, 909.
Bell, Lydia, iii, 693.
Bell, Dr. T. S., ii, 862.
Bellows, Dr., on woman's rights, i, 245.
Bennett, Dr. Alice, iii, 472.
Bennett, James Gordon, i, 546.
Bentham, Jeremy, iii, 836.
Bequests, i, 257, 258, 667, 742.
Berlin, iii, 903.
Berlin Congress, ii, 404.
Bible, Antoinette L. Brown's points, i, 535—divorce, and, i, 213—interpolations, i, 797—revision, i, 798—woman and the, discussion, i, 380.
Biggs, Caroline A., letter to S. B. Anthony, iii, 250—letter to Rochester Convention, iii, 120—letter to Washington Convention, iii, 261.
Biggs, Emily J., iii, 702.
Bingham, Anson, i, 687, ii, 461.
BIOGRAPHY: Austin, Helen V., i, 312—Blake, Lillie D., iii, 408—Barton, Clara, ii, 23—Boyd, Louise V., i, 312—Brown, Olympia, iii, 646—Clark, Mary T., i, 312—Colby, Clara B., iii, 670—Collins, Emily, i, 88—Davis, Paulina Wright, by "E. C. S.", i, 283—Duniway, Abigail S., iii, 768—Griffing, Josephine Sophie, ii, 26—Lozier, Clemence, iii, 411—Morrow, Jane, i, 313—Owen, Mary Robinson, i, 313—Owen, Robert Dale, i, 293—Rose, Ernestine, i, 95—Swank, Emma B., i, 313—Thomas, Mary F., i, 314—Underhill, Sarah E., i, 313—Warren, Mercy Otis, in the Revolution, i, 201—Way, Amanda M., i, 311—Wright, Frances, i, 35.
Bird, Frank W., iii, 194.
Birdsall, Mary B., sketch of, i, 313.
Bittenbender, Ada M., sketch of, iii, 692.
Blackstone on the canon law, i, 771.
BLACKWELL, Antoinette L. B., ii, 760—letter to Cooper Institute Convention, i, 862—marriage and divorce, on, i, 723—speech at American Woman Suffrage Association meeting in New York, ii, 841—Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 69. (See Brown, A. L.)
BLACKWELL, Elizabeth, i, 37, 78—letter to Emily Collins, i, 90—letter to Westchester, Pa., Convention, i, 831—physician, as a, i, 94—sanitary commission, ii, 13.

Digitized by Google

BLACKWELL, Henry B., ii, 382—Kansas Campaign, ii, 232, 235—South, on the, ii, 929—speech at American Woman Suffrage Association meeting in Steinway Hall, ii, 811—at American Woman Suffrage Association meeting in Cooper Institute, ii, 830—Cleveland Convention, i, 126, ii, 780—President of Am. Woman Suffrage Association, made, ii, 856—*Vermont Watchman*, on iii, 386—Woman Suffrage in New Jersey, on, ii, 846.
BLAKE, Lillie Devereux, iii, 74, 223, 483—Argument before House Committee, iii, 163—sketch of, iii, 408—Dix's Lenten lectures, her reply to, iii, 436—lectures "Woman's Place to-day," iii, 436—Washington Convention '76, iii, 7—Washington Convention, at, ii, 541—Fable, "The Selfish Rats," iii, 114——speech, Battle of Lexington Commemoration, iii, 414.
Blake, S. L., against woman suffrage, iii, 371.
Blaine, Jas. G., iii, 164, 165, 366.
Blair, Henry W., letter to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 380.
BLOOMER, Amelia, i, 46—address before Nebraska Legislature, iii, 672—Cleveland National Convention, at, i, 128—comments on Jane G. Swisshelm, i, 844—portrait, i, 496—replies to Senator Gaylord's speech against woman suffrage, iii, 623—speech at Rochester Temperance Convention, i, 483—work done, iii, 613.
Bloomer costume, i, 127, 469, 844.
Blunt, Gen., Kansas campaign, ii, 243.
Boarding House Law, i, 688.
Bodeker, Anna W., iii, 823—vote, attempted to, iii, 824.
Bohemia, iii, 907.
Bolton, Sarah Knowles, iii, 494.
Bolton, Sarah T., i, 300.
Bones, Marietta, address to Dakota Constitutional Convention, iii, 665.
Booth, Mary L., i, 48, 624, ii, 433.
Boston Commonwealth, report of fifth Washington Convention, ii, 543.
Boston Convention, i, 255.
Boston Transcript, iii, 227.
Bottsford, Harriette, iii, 623.
Bower, E. S., iii, 700.
Bowles, Ada C., iii, 194.
Bowles, Samuel, letter to Mrs. Hooker, iii, 325.
Boyd, Louise V., sketch of, i, 312.
Bradburn, Geo., address, i, 56.
Bradlaugh, Charles, speaks in New York for woman suffrage, ii, 842.
Bradley, Judge, on the XIV. Amendment, ii, 457—opinion, Bradwell case, ii, 624.
Bradstreet, Anne, i, 204, iii, 302.
Bradwell, Myra, application to Illinois Bar, ii, 601—opinion denying, ii, 609—Carpenter's, Matt. H., argument, ii, 615—opinion of Justice Bradley, ii, 624—report of proceedings in Illinois and U. S. Snpreme Courts, ii, 614—U. S. Supreme Court decision, ii, 622—writ of error, ii, 614.
Brent, Margaret, first woman in America to claim the right to vote, iii, 815.
BRIGHT, Jacob, iii, 727, 841—letter to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 438—municipal franchise bill, secures, iii, 845—became law, iii, 847—Parliament, fails of re-election, iii, 853—speech on woman suffrage, iii, 849, 873—votes for woman suffrage, iii, 842.
Bright, John, ii, 349, 366, 420—speech against woman suffrage, iii, 861.
Bright, Wm. H., career of, iii, 729.
Brinkerhoff, Martha H., iii, 614.
British taxation, ii, 202.
Bromwell, H. P. H., iii, 720.
Brooklyn Bridge, iii, 440.
Brooks, James, on woman suffrage, ii, 97.
Brooks, Harriet S., sketch of, iii, 692.
Broomall, John H., iii, 464.
Brougham, Lord, i, 633.
BROWN, Antoinette L., i, 41, 119, 186, 624—Bible argument, points on the, i, 535—colleges, on i, 144—on the Half-world's Temperance Convention, i, 507—pastor, ordained as, i, 473—portrait, i, 449—resolutions, Albany Convention, i, 593—speech at Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 553—Syracuse National Convention, argument, i, 524—World's Temperance Convention, at the, i, 152. (See Blackwell, A. L. B.)
Brown, B. Gratz, speech, ii, 136—universal suffrage, on, iii, 598.
Brown, David Paul, i, 333.
Brown, Martha McClellan, iii, 226.
Brown, Mary Olney, iii, 767—argument, her right to vote, iii, 783—vote, attempts to, iii, 780, 785.
BROWN, Olympia, iii, 73, 267, 301—discussion with Fred. Douglass, ii, 311—Kansas, in, i, 200, ii, 239, 240, 241—letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 259—sketch of, iii, 646—speech at Equal Rights Association anniversary, Cooper Institute, ii, 309—speech before Congressional Committee, iii, 95—speech, Washington Convention, '76, iii, 7—speech at Washington Convention, ii, 422.
Brown, R. T., speech on suffrage, ii, 853.
Brown, Sarah A., nominated for office, iii, 705.
Brown, Wm. Wells, ii, 368.
Bruhn, Rosa, letter to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 439.
Buchanan, James, ii, 204.
Buck, J. D., iii, 511.

Digitized by Google

Buckalew, Senator, speech, ii, 146.
Buckingham, Mrs., iii, 337.
Buckley, Brother, on women as preachers, i, 784.
Burger, Sarah, iii, 526 (see Stearns, S. B.).
Burleigh, Celia, ii, 402, 790, 801, 817.
Burleigh, Charles C., i, 148, 549' 558, ii, 194, 392, 818.
Burnet, Rev. J., i, 55.
Burnham, Carrie S., ii, 600, iii, 444.
Burns, Anthony, i, 254.
Burns, Robert, ii, 266.
Burr, Frances Ellen, iii, 319—letters to S. B. Anthony, ii, 912, iii, 334—Senate Judiciary Committee, argument before, ii, 543.
Burtis, Sarah Anthony, i, 76.
Burton, Mary, iii, 852.
Bush, Abigail, i, 75, iii, 120.
BUTLER, Benj. F., letters to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 539, iii, 255—report on Victoria C. Woodhull's memorial to Congress, ii, 464—speech, ii, 514.
Butler David, iii, 691.
Butler, Deborah, ii, 348.
Butler, Josephine E., on prostitution, iii, 145—vice, on, i, 795.

C.

Cadwallader, John, i, 330.
CALIFORNIA, iii, 749—Appendix, iii, 977—constitution, liberal provisions, 750—constitution and statute-laws, 760—Conventions (*see Conventions*)—journalism, 761—Mill's Seminary, 751—petition to Legislature, 755—press, *ib.*—senator, Mrs. Gordon nominated for, 756—silk culture, 762—State Society organized, 754—woman's lawyer bill, 757—woman suffrage society, first, 752—women made eligible to school offices, 757—women in the industries, 763—women in the State University, contest, 758.
Cameron, Don, iii, 176.
Campbell, Margaret W., iii, 269, 716—speech in Detroit, ii, 839.
Campbell, Mary G., iii, 712.
Canada, women's position in, iii, 831.
Canon law i, 755, 769, 770, 771, 774.
Carey, Mary A. S., iii, 72.
Carey, Samuel F., i, 121, 154.
Carpenter Hall, application for, iii, 16.
Carpenter, C. C., letter to Iowa Woman Suffrage Association, iii, 621.
Carpenter, Matt. H., on Sargent's amendment to Pembina Territory bill, ii, 562—Anthony, Susan B., trial, on, ii, 701—argument in Myra Bradwell's application to Illinois Bar, ii, 615—letter to Elizabeth C. Stanton, ii, 423.
Carr, Jeanne, iii, 751.
CARROLL, Anna Ella, iii, 153—claim before Congress, ii, 12, 863—statement of Benj. F. Wade, ii, 865—letters, ii, 865, 866, 867, 868—Tennessee campaign, ii, 3—Vicksburg, on, ii, 11.
Cartter, Mrs. M. M., ii, 442.
Cartter, Chief-Justice, opinion, Spencer-Webster suit, ii, 597.
Cary, Alice and Phœbe, ii, 433.
Catherine II., i, 34.
Catholic Church, ii, 201, 207.
Cattle expert, Middie Morgan, iii, 404.
Cavender, John H., i, 328.
Centennial celebration, iii, 411.
Centennial headquarters, iii, 21.
Centennial Tea-Party, iii, 269.
Centennial year, iii, 1.
Centralization, iii, 89—Matilda J. Gage, on, ii, 523.
Century Club, Philadelphia, iii, 469.
Chace, Elizabeth B., iii, 340, 341, 348.
Chalkstone, Mrs., ii, 59.
Chamberlain, D. H., favors woman suffrage, iii, 829.
Chambers, Rev. John, i, 159, 167, 500, 508.
Chandler, Dolly, iii, 275.
Chandler, Z., on Mrs. J. S. Griffing and the freedmen, ii, 33.
CHANNING, William Henry, i, 476, 583, 584, 587, 591—appeal, woman's rights, i, 588—resolutions, Rochester Convention, i, 580—social relations, report on, i, 233—speech at Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 550—Woman's Rights, Declaration, i, 129—World's Temperance Convention and John Chambers, on the, i, 508, iii, 922.
Chapin, Augusta, iii, 276.
Chapin, Clara C., iii, 691, 693.
Chapin, E. H., i, 476.
Chaplain, Mrs. E. F. Hobart, ii, 18.
Chapman, Maria Weston, i, 53—poem, i, 82.
Chase, Salmon P., i, 167, ii, 73, iii, 808.
Cheever, George B., ii, 226.
Chicago Historical Society, iii, 179.
Chicago Inter-Ocean, iii, 682.
Chicago Legal News, iii, 562.
Chicago Legal News Company, ii, 607.
CHILD, Lydia Maria, i, 38, 258, 775—letter to E. C. Stanton, ii, 910—letter to St. Louis Convention, ii, 825—petitions Congress, iii, 266—universal suffrage, on, iii, 519.
Children, guardianship of, i, 747—illegitimate, i, 760—rearing of, i, 304.
Christine of Pisa, i, 29.
Christlieb, Prof., i, 787.
Church and State, i, 753.
Church, Elmwood, Illinois, iii, 563.
Churchill, Elizabeth K., iii, 371—woman suffrage, on, ii, 812.
CITIZENSHIP, ii, 462, 468, 469, 470, 473, 532, 555, 556, 665—Bates, Attorney-General, on, ii, 461—Blake, Devereux, on, iii, 7—Curtis, Justice, on, ii. 472—Daniel, Justice, on, ii, 471—Stanton,

Digitized by Google

Elizabeth C., speech on, iii, 80—Taney, Justice, on, ii, 472—term defined, ii, 451—Thorbeck, on, ii, 473—White, Richard Grant, on, ii, 567.
Citizenship, women crowned with rights of, in Wyoming, iii, 726.
Claiborne, F. L., iii, 795.
Clark, Emily, i, 489.
Clark, Helen Bright, iii, 874.
Clark, Mary T., sketch of, i, 312.
Clark, Sidney, ii, 363.
Clarke, Hannah B., on woman suffrage, ii, 807.
Clarke, Jas. Freeman, on suffrage, i, 258, ii, 768, iii, 266—speech, New England, Convention, i, 263.
Clarke, Mary Bayard, iii, 825.
Clarkson, Thomas, i, 54.
Clay, Mary B., iii, 818.
Clemmer, Mary, letter to S. B. Anthony, iii, 262—letter to Senator Wadleigh, iii, 111.
Clergy, charges against, i, 135—celibacy of, i, 757.
Clergymen and corkscrews, ii, 167.
Cleveland, Grover, iii, 437.
Clute, Oscar, on woman suffrage, ii, 770.
Cobbe, Francis Power, iii, 865—letter to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 438.
Cobden, Jane, iii, 875.
Cobden, Richard, favors woman suffrage, iii, 835.
Coe, Emma R., i, 146, 232.
Cogswell, Brainard, iii, 371.
Colburn, Catharine A., iii, 774.
Colburn, Mary J., iii, 650.
Colby, Clara Bewick, iii, 222—sketch of, iii, 670.
Colby University opened to girls, iii, 355.
Cole, Mrs. Miriam M., ii, 790, 806, 832, iii, 501.
Coleman, Lucy N., speech at Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 62.
Coleridge, Lord, iii, 844.
Colfax, Schuyler, ii, 181.
Colleges, iii, 399—women in, i, 144.
Colleges for women, iii, 296.
College, Woman's, Evanston, Ill., iii, 578.
Collier, Robert Laird, iii, 567.
Collins, Emily, reminiscences of, i, 88—Miss Sarah Owen's correspondence, i, 91.
Collins, Jennie, speech at Washington Convention, ii, 423.
Collins, Stacy B., iii, 482.
Collyer, Robert, ii, 368, 371, 372—recollections of Lucretia Mott, i, 409, 414—speech at Chicago, iii, 565.
COLORADO: clergy, iii, 720—Conventions, *See Conventions*—Desert, great American, iii, 712—equal-rights mass-meeting in Denver, 722—leaders in the cause, 719—legislation, 714, 715—press, 715—suffrage amendment, defeat of, 723—suffrage first effort for, 712—suffrage, Gov. McCook's message, 713—woman suffrage, Gov. Evan's on, 722.
Colorado Tribune, iii, 715.
Columbia College, effort to open to women, iii, 410.
Colvin, N. J., letters to S. B. Anthony, i, 691, 750; ii, 914.
Conciliatory amendments, ii, 527.
Concord Monitor, iii, 371.
Congress, first Continental, iii, 17—Elizabeth C. Stanton runs for, ii, 180—Victoria C. Woodhull's memorial, 443—Riddle's speech in support of, 448—House majority report, 461—Minority report, 464.
CONGRESSIONAL ACTION, ii, 90—Anthony, Senator, speech, ii, 106—arguments before House Committee, iii, 161—arguments before Senate Committee, iii, 155—Banks' N. P., speech, iii, 10—Brooks' James, speech, ii, 96—Brown's, Senator, speech, ii, 136—Buckalew's, Senator, speech, ii, 146—Butler's, Benj., speech, ii, 514—Committee, special, House appoints, iii, 221—Committee, special, on woman suffrage, Senate discussion, iii, 198—Committee, special, on woman suffrage, House discussion, iii, 219—Committee, standing, Senate discussion, iii, 190—Cowan, Senator, speech, ii, 103, 110—Cowan repels the charge of insincerity, ii, 121—Davis's Senator, speech, ii, 144—Debate, Senate and House, iii, 70—Democrats and the petitions, ii, 95—District of Columbia suffrage bill, ii, 103—vote, ii, 151—District of Columbia bill, Julian's amendment, ii, 482—Doolittle, Senator, speech against, ii, 150—electors, who constitute, House debates, ii, 326—female employées, iii, 811—Frelinghuysen's, Senator, speech, ii, 135—hearing before Senate Committee, iii, 227—Henderson, Senator, presents Mrs. Gerrit Smith's petition with a speech, ii, 98—House discussion, ii, 514—Johnson's, Senator, speech, ii, 130—joint resolutions before House affecting women, ii, 72—Julian's bills, ii, 325—Morrill's, Senator, speech, ii, 118—National Association granted hearing, iii, 75—Negro's hour, ii, 94—Parker's bill, ii, 516—Pembina Territory bill, debate on, Sargent's amendment, ii, 545; am't rejected, 582; Anthony's remarks, 568; Bayard's remarks, 567, 575; Boreman's remarks, 549, 580; Carpenter's remarks, 562; Conkling's remarks, 558, 559; Edmund's remarks, 562, 569, 571, 572, 573, 580; Ferry's remarks, 568; Flanagan's remarks, 552; Merrimon's remarks, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 560; Morrill's remarks, 562; Morton's remarks, 549, 569; Sargent's remarks, 546, 555, 564, 567; Stewart's remarks,

548, 558, 559, 564, 573, 579. Petition, iii, 9—petition read and referred, iii, 130—petition, Rhode Island, ii, 560—petition for universal suffrage, ii, 97—petitions against the word "male" in Constitution, ii, 91—Pomeroy's, Senator, resolution, ii, 324—Pomeroy's, Senator, speech, ii, 151—Report, first favorable majority, iii, 231—report, first favorable, Senate, iii, 131—report, minority, iii, 237—reports on Victoria C. Woodhull's memorial, ii, 461, 464—reports, iii, 150—Republicans' protest in presenting petitions, ii, 94, 96—Republicans, squirming of, ii, 101—resolution to appoint special committee, iii, 175—Sargent, Senator, speech, iii, 9—Sixteenth Amendment, ii, 333—Sixteenth Amendment, resolutions, iii, 154—Stevens', Thaddeus, resolution, ii, 95—Sumner, Charles, presents a petition under protest, ii, 96; why he protested, ii, 100. Wade, Benj. F., speech, ii, 123—Williams, Senator, speech against, ii, 108—Wilson's, Senator, bill, ii, 324—Wilson's, Senator, speech, ii, 128.

Conkling, Roscoe, ii, 363—on Senator McDonald's Woman Suffrage resolution, iii, 191—talk with, ii, 347—Senator Stewart and woman suffrage, on, ii, 558.

Connecticut, iii, 316—Appendix, iii, 957—Bar, admission to the, iii, 330—Legislature, minority report, iii, 317.

Constitution, Story on the, ii, 477, 478, 588.

Constitution and suffrage, ii, 741.

Continental Europe, iii, 895.

CONVENTIONS: American Woman Suffrage Association (*See Am. Woman Suffrage Association*)—barn, in a, i, 123—*California*, San Francisco, iii, 753, 760—*Connecticut*, Hartford, iii, 197, 322—*Colorado*, Denver, iii, 716, 720—*Illinois*, Bloomington, iii, 572, Chicago, ii, 368, iii, 175, 565, 570; Galena, ii, 375; Springfield, ii, 371, iii, 570.—*Indiana*, Dublin, Wayne Co., i, 306; Indianapolis, i, 307, iii, 175, 534, 537; Richmond, i, 307; Winchester, i, 308;—*Iowa*, Des Moines, iii, 618, 623, 624; Mount Pleasant, iii, 617; Ottumwa, iii, 624.—*Kansas*, Topeka, iii, 702, 709; Salina, iii, 709.—London, first ever held, ii, 406—Loyalists' ii, 329—*Maine*, Augusta, iii, 359, 363; Portland, iii, 197, 352—*Massachusetts*, Boston, ii, 178, iii, 192—Worcester (Nat.), i, 215, 266—*Michigan*, Detroit, iii, 516; Grand Rapids, iii, 530; Lansing, iii, 519—*Minnesota*, Minneapolis, iii, 659—*Missouri*, St. Louis, ii, 369, 407, iii, 142, 601, 606—National, in 1866-67, report by Caroline H. Dall, ii, 899—*Nebraska*, Kearney, iii, 688, 694; Norfolk, iii, 689; Omaha, iii, 241, 687, 690—New England, i, 254, 255, 262; iii, 267—*New Hampshire*, Concord, iii, 270, 368; Dover, iii, 197; Keene, *ib.*; New Haven, *ib.*—*New Jersey*, Vineland, iii, 479—*New York*, Albany, i, 591, 628, 678, 745; Rochester, i, 75, 577, press comments, i, 802; Rochester, iii, 117; Saratoga, ii, 402; Burleigh's, Celia, description, ii, 402; Saratoga, i, 620, 623; Saratoga, iii, 396; Seneca Falls, i, 67, press comments, i, 802; Syracuse (Nat.), i, 517, press comments i, 852—New York Constitutional, ii, 269, 282—New York City, Apollo Hall, ii, 427, 484, 533; Broadway Tabernacle i, 631, 546; Church of the Puritans (Nat.), 152; Cooper Institute (Nat.), i, 688; Irving Hall, ii, 426, 545; Masonic Temple, ii, 584, iii, 19, 98; Mozart Hall (Nat.), i, 668, 672; Steinway Hall, ii, 809—*Ohio*, Akron, i, 111; Cincinnati (Nat.), i, 163; Cincinnati, iii, 492; Cleveland (Nat.), i, 124; Cleveland, ii, 757; Dayton, iii, 493; Massilon, i, 123; Salem, i, 103; Toledo, ii, 377, iii, 506. *Oregon*, Portland, iii, 773—Paris, International, iii, 127, 585, 896—*Pennsylvania*, Philadelphia, i, 375, iii, 34, 229; Westchester, i, 350—*Rhode Island*, Newport, ii, 403; Providence, iii, 197, 340—*South Carolina*, Columbia, iii, 828—*Vermont*, Montpelier, iii, 385—*Washington Ter.*, Walla Walla, iii, 775—Washington, D. C., ii, 345, 356, 359, 416, 418, 425, 417, 442, 493, 521, 537, 538, 543, 582, iii, 3, 60, 71, 128, 150, 187, 221, 254—*Wisconsin*, Janesville, iii, 642; Madison, ii, 374; Milwaukee, ii, 374, iii, 640; Racine, iii, 645.

Conventions, Constitutional, Kansas, i, 189—Massachusetts, i, 253—New York, ii, 267—Ohio, i, 105—Pennsylvania, iii, 465.

Conventions held in Washington, why, iii, 150.

Cooper, Edward, against woman suffrage, iii, 422.

Cooper, Joseph, i, 447.

Cooper, Peter, iii, 399.

"Copperheads," going over to the, ii, 320.

Corbin, Hannah Lee, i, 33.

Cornell, A. B., iii, 223, 423.

Cornell, University, iii, 398.

Corner, Mary T., i, 122, iii, 810.

Correll, E. M., ii, 862, iii, 691.

Correspondence, *See Letters*.

Corson, Hiram, letter to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 472.

Courtney, Leonard, iii, 862.

COUZINS, Phœbe W., iii, 7, 66, 370—address, "Woman as a Lawyer," ii, 542—argument before House Committee, iii, 170—delegate to National Demo-

Digitized by Google

cratic Convention, iii, 27—Labors of, iii, 596—reception, iii, 610—Senate Judiciary Committee, argument before, ii, 543—Speeches: Centennial, iii, 36, St. Louis Convention, iii, 142; Washington Convention, 223, 258; Woman Suffrage, ii, 387.
Couzins, Mrs. J. E. D., as a nurse, iii, 596.
Covenant, Ladies' National, ii, 39.
Cowan, Senator, speech on District of Columbia suffrage bill, ii, 163, 110.
Cowles, Betsey M., i, 104.
Cox, Rt. Rev. Dr., i, 782.
Crandall, Prudence, iii, 316, 560, 703.
Craven, Rev. E. A., on Woman in the Pulpit, iii, 485.
Crawford, S. J., ii, 251.
Cromwellian era, i, 775.
Crosby, Howard, letter to Mrs. M. J. Gage, i, 798.
Crow, Wayman, iii, 595.
Crowley, Richard, argument Miss Anthony's trial, ii, 648.
"Crown and Anchor," i, 438.
Culver, Hon. Erastus D., speech at Cooper Institute Convention, i, 709.
CURTIS, Geo. Wm., i, 668; ii, 378; iii, 440—speech on woman suffrage, ii, 795—speech, Constitutional Convention at Albany, ii, 288—suffrage for women, favors, i, 672.
Cushman, Major Pauline, ii, 20.
Cutler, Hannah M. T., i, 123, 163, 380, 384; ii, 773, 788, 809, 818, 823, 853; iii, 561, 614, 675.

D.

Dahlgren, Madeleine, ii, 494, 495, iii, 101.
DAKOTA, iii, 662—address to women of, M. J. Gage's, iii, 663—Constitutional Convention, iii, 664—Legislative action, iii, 662—school suffrage, iii, 663, 666—suffrage bill passed Legislature, iii, 667—vetoed, iii, 667.
DALL, Caroline H., "Drawing-room Convention, i, 276—lectures, i, 262—letter to *The Nation*, ii, 101—petition, i, 262—reports National Conventions held in '66 and '67, ii, 899—speech, New England Convention, i, 265.
Dana, Richard H., on womanhood, i, 367—woman suffrage, on, i, 41.
Darlington, Hannah M., i, 349—letter to Mrs. E. C. Stanton, i, 344.
Darrah, Lydia, i, 321.
Dartmouth College case, ii, 725.
Daughters of Liberty, i, 203.
Davis, Senator, speech against woman suffrage, ii, 144.
Davis, Edward M., ii, 358, iii, 45, 462.
Davis, Jefferson, ii, 542.
Davis, J. J., iii, 154.
Davis, Mary F., ii, 390, 791, iii, 480.
DAVIS, Paulina Wright, i, 37, 46, iii, 823—colored women on, ii, 391—death of, i, 827—Fifteenth Amendment, on the, ii, 336—portrait, i, 273—President, made, Boston Convention, i, 255—President, made, Worcester convention, i, 221—President, made, Worcester National Convention, i, 227—reminiscences of, Elizabeth Cady Stanton's, i, 283—speech, Boston Convention, i, 256—speech, Syracuse National Convention, i, 533—*The Una*, i, 246—woman's rights movement, review of, ii, 428.
Deaths, Mrs. Dall's report, ii, 905.
Decisions and Trials, ii, 586.
Declaration, Channing's, i, 129.
Declaration of sentiments, i, 70.
Declaration and pledge, ii, 486.
DeFoe, Daniel, i, 29.
Delaware, iii, 817.
Democrats advocated woman suffrage, ii, 320.
Denmark, iii, 914.
Dentistry, Lucy B. Hobbs, iii, 401, 455.
Dentistry, women in, iii, 452.
Deroine, Jeanne, address to women of America, i, 234.
DICKINSON, Anna E., ii, 375, iii, 320, 811—California, in, iii, 752—Chicago Convention, at, ii, 368—Fifteenth Amendment, her suggestion, ii, 227—letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 916—speech, Chicago, iii, 567—speeches, ii, 40—tribute, ii, 433—"Young Elephant," ii, 42.
Dilke, Sir Charles, iii, 847.
Dimock, Susan, tribute, iii, 827.
Dinsmoor, Orpha C., sketch of, iii, 693.
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, iii, 808—Conventions (see Conventions); Miner Normal School, iii, 809—Organic Act, iii, 812—suffrage bill, iii, 809, ii, 103, 482—Universal Franchise Association, iii, 809—women admitted to District bar, iii, 812—women in government departments, iii, 808—women in the profession of medicine, iii, 812—women writers and teachers, iii, 813.
Disraeli on woman suffrage, iii, 839.
Dix, Dorothea, i, 479, ii, 12.
Dix, John A., i, 530.
Dix, Morgan, Lenten lectures, iii, 436—Mrs. Blake's reply, iii, 436—coëducation, on, iii, 410.
Divorce (see Marriage and Divorce).
Dodge, Mary Mapes, i, 49.
Dolph, J. N., iii, 778.
Doolittle's, Senator, speech against woman suffrage, ii, 150.
Dorsett, Martha Angle, lawyer, iii, 660.
Dorsey, Sarah A., iii, 794, 807.
Doud, Katharine R., iii, 645.
DOUGLAS, Frederick, i, 74, 584, 585, 587, ii, 391, iii, 74, 125—discussion with Olympia Brown, ii, 311—Fif-

Digitized by Google

teenth Amendment, on the origin of, ii, 326—Kansas campaign, ii, 265—letter to Elizabeth Cady Stanton, ii, 328—Loyalists' Convention, delegate, ii, 329—refuge in Mrs. E. C. Stanton's house, ii, 382—*Revolution*, on the, ii, 382—wolf-skins, in, ii, 377—speech, Washington Convention '76, iii, 7.
Douglass, Sarah M., i, 332.
Douglass, Stephen A., ii, 263, 301.
Dow, Neal, i, 121, 154.
Downing, Geo. T., ii, 214, 215, 377.
Downing, Lucy, iii, 296.
Downs, Cora M., made a Regent, iii, 706.
Doyle, Sarah E. H., iii, 344.
Draper, E. D., ii, 242.
Dresser, Horace, ii, 952.
Duchess of Sutherland, i, 421.
Dugdale, Jos. A., on wills, i, 357.
DUNIWAY, Abigail Scott, arrest of, ordered, iii, 774—career, iii, 768—egged at Jacksonville, Oregon, iii, 775—Constitutional liberty, on, *ib.*—lecturing tour, iii, 769—temperance meeting, at a, iii, 772.

E.

Eaglesfield, Elizabeth, iii, 549.
Earl, Sarah H., tribute, i, 217—President New England Convention, made, i, 254.
Eastman, Mary F., speeches, ii, 829, 840, 845, 854.
Ecclesine, Thos. C., iii, 420.
Eddy, Eliza F., will case, iii, 312.
Edgerton, A. J., on woman suffrage, iii, 666.
Editor, first colored, i, 91.
Editors, opinions of three liberal, ii, 227.
Editors interviewed, iii, 623.
Edmunds, Senator, on State rights and suffrage, ii, 561, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 580—woman suffrage, on, iii, 70.
Education, Mrs. Dall's report, ii, 900.
Education, compulsory, iii, 61.
Education, equal, ii, 909.
Educational movement, iii, 398.
Eggleston, Edward, on woman suffrage, ii, 810.
Eldridge, Edward, iii, 781.
Electors, qualification of, ii, 272, 463-4.
Eliot, Rev. Wm. G., i, 171.
Elizabeth, Queen, i, 30.
Ellsworth, Bertha H., iii, 700.
Elstob, Elizabeth, i, 30.
Emancipation Petition, ii, 78.
Emerson, on Power of Human Mind, ii, 427.
Episcopal restrictions, i, 785.
Essex County Society, iii, 270.
Estabrook, Prof., speech for woman suffrage, ii, 839.
"Eumenes", i, 451.
Evans, L. D., ii, 10, iii, 801.
Evarts, Wm. M., upon woman's subordination, i, 789, iii, 53.

F.

Fable, "The Selfish Rats," iii, 114.
Fales, Mrs. L. C., speech on suffrage, ii, 851.
Fairchild, Governor, ii, 375.
Faithful, Emily, letter to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 440.
Farnham, Eliza W., iii, 750—speech at Mozart Hall, i, 669, iii, 750.
Ferrin, Mary Upton, i, 209, iii, 289—speech before Judiciary Committee, Massachusetts Legislature, i, 212.
Ferry, Thos. W., ii, 568, iii, 28, 154, on the Pembrina Territory bill, ii, 568.
Feudalism, i, 761-3.
Flanagan, Senator, on Sargent's amendment to Pembrina Territory bill, ii, 552.
Florida, iii, 829.
Field, Anna C., ii, 398.
Field, David Dudley, iii, 647.
Field, Kate, i, 620.
Fields, Jas. T., letter to H. B. Blackwell, ii, 838.
Fifteenth Amendment, ii, 314, 327, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 387, 455, 463, 478, 479, 502, 503, 556, 557, 569, 616, 618, 619, 641, 642, 663.
Filley, Mary Powers, iii, 97, 380.
Foeking, Emilie, iii, 816.
Foley, Margaret, iii, 301.
Folger, Chas. J., i, 750, ii, 271, iii, 801.
Folsom, Marianna, iii, 703.
Foltz, Clara S., iii, 757.
Foote, Samuel A., i, 629.
Forbes, Arathusa L., iii, 596.
Ford, Jennie G., iii, 693.
Forney, John W., on women and hospital clinics, 3, 450.
Foster, Abby Kelly, i, 40, 53, 101, 134, ii, 216.
Foster, J. Ellen, iii, 536.
Foster, Julia, i, 301.
Foster, Rachel, i, 391, iii, 474.
Foster, Stephen S., i, 141, ii, 381, iii, 372.
Fourteenth Amendment, ii, 313, 315, 323, 324, 327, 407, 411, 412, 422, 455, 457, 461, 463, 468, 478, 479, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 556, 586, 590, 593, 595, 596, 619, 617, 618, 619, 621, 622, 624, 625, 626, 641, 642, 663.
Fox, Charles James, i, 453.
Fox, W. J., on women in politics, iii, 836.
Fowler, Lydia F., i, 178, 478, 491.
France, ii, 202—agitation in, address of Pauline Roland and Jeanne Deroine, i, 234—international woman's rights congress, iii, 896.
"Frank Miller," ii, 19.
Franklin, Benjamin, i, 324, ii, 244, 475.
Franklin, William, i, 441.
Freedmen's Relief Association, Mrs. J.

Digitized by Google

S. Griffing, ii, 26—Josephine Griffing's letter to Lucretia Mott, ii, 869—letters on the, ii, 45—originator of, ii, 38.
Freeland, Margaret, arrest of, i, 475.
Frelinghuysen, F. G., speech, ii, 135.
Fremont, Jessie B., letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 911.
Fremont, Jno. C., Presidential campaign, i, 651.
French, Charlotte Olney, iii, 784.
Frothingham, O. B., ii, 186, 248, 380, 545.
Fry, Elizabeth, i, 479.
Fry, Elizabeth, and Lucretia Mott, i, 423.
Frye, Wm. P., iii, 105, 366.
Fuller, Margaret, i, 40, 49, 217, 801; iii, 307.
Fulton, W. C., iii, 776.
Furness' church, iii, 35.

G

GAGE, Frances Dana, ii, 112, 113, 114, 116, iii, 561—Cleveland Convention, at, i, 124—lectures in Iowa, iii, 613—letter to American Woman Suffrage Association, ii, 769—at Cincinnati, ii, 857—letter to Matilda Joslyn Gage, i, 117—letter to *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, ii, 176—letter to Lucy Stone, i, 656—letter to Rochester Temperance Convention, i, 845—letter to Washington Convention, ii, 424—mothers and their children, on, i, 360—National Convention, Philadelphia, at, i, 325—negro testimony quoted by Senator Cowan in U. S. Senate, ii, 115—Nichols, Mrs., and, i, 198—orator, as an, i, 168—portrait, i, 128—reminiscences of Sojourner Truth, i, 115—reply to Gerrit Smith's letter to Mrs. Stanton, i, 842—speech, Akron Convention, i, 111; Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 563; Winchester, Ind., Convention, i, 308; Equal Rights Association Convention, ii, 197, 200—her last speech, ii, 223; temperance and the ballot, ii, 211.
GAGE, Matilda Joslyn, i, 589, 591, iii, 65, 151, 227, 437—address to women of Dakota, iii, 663—Anthony case, her letter to *Albany Law Journal*, ii, 947—appeal, iii, 413—argument before House Committee, iii, 167—Carpenter Hall, application for, iii, 17—church influence on woman's liberties, iii, 74—divorce on, i, 566—Grant and Wilson campaign, appeal, ii, 517—letter to wife of Admiral Dahlgren, ii, 494—letter to Dakota Constitutional Convention, iii, 664—letter to Omaha convention, iii, 259—Minor suit, her review of Judge Waite's opinion, ii, 742—*National Citizen* prospectus, iii, 116—*National Citizen and Ballot-Box*, i, 47—petition, political disabilities, iii, 60—portrait, i, 753—report, iii, 522—sketch of, i, 466—speeches: Centralization, at Washington Convention, ii, 523; Congressional Committees, before, ii, 415, iii, 10, 93; Furness' church, in, iii, 35; Rochester Convention, i, 579; Saratoga Convention, i, 622; Syracuse National Convention, i, 528; United States on trial, not Susan B. Anthony, ii, 630; Washington National Convention, iii, 4—Sunderland controversy, i, 543—Van Schaick, and Mr., i, 406—Woman, Church and State, i, 753.
"Gail Hamilton," iii, 365.
Gaines, Myra Clark, iii, 801.
Gale's, Senator, insulting epithets, i, 483.
Gallup, J. D., iii, 319.
Galusha, Eben, address, i, 55.
Gardner, Nannette B., ii, 587—votes in Michigan, iii, 523.
Garfield, James A., letter to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 185.
Garret, Eliza, iii, 582.
Garrett, Thomas, iii, 818.
GARRISON, Wm. Lloyd, argument at Cleveland National Convention, i, 136—attacked by Dr. Nevin, i, 144—on Gen. Carey, i, 162—letter to American Woman Suffrage Association meeting in Philadelphia, ii, 816—letter to Concord Convention, iii, 368—letter to Rochester Convention, iii, 122—letter to Worcester National Convention, i, 216—London Anti-slavery Convention, and the, i, 61—marriage and divorce, on, i, 733—National Convention, Philadelphia, at, i, 378—speech at Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 548, 570—tracts and petitions, on, i, 383—tribute to Mrs. J. S. Griffing, ii, 38—woman suffrage, apathy, ii, 322—women in national councils, on the right of, i, 672—World's Temperance Convention, on the, i, 160.
Gay, Sidney Howard, ii, 369.
Gaylord, Senator, iii, 623.
Geddes, Geo., on the Property bill, i, 64.
Generals, why kept in the army, ii, 75.
Geneva, iii, 909.
George Eliot, i, 302.
Georgia, iii, 830.
Germans against woman suffrage, ii, 231.
Germany, iii, 902.
Gibbons, Abby Hopper, i, 40.
Gibbs, Sarah A., dissection of a sermonizer, iii, 391.
Gibson, Anthony, i, 29.
Giddings, Joshua R., on woman suffrage, i, 128—World's Temperance Convention, on the, i, 162.
Giddings, Maria L., i, 114.
Gillette, Rev. Mrs., ii, 837.
Gillingham, Lydia, i, 324.

Digitized by Google

Girls and boys, ii, 541.
Gladden, Washington, on woman suffrage, ii, 815.
GLADSTONE, ii, 293, 366—Catholicism, i, 27—speech on woman suffrage, iii, 850, 854, 877, 883, 888.
Goddard, Sarah, i, 44.
Godwin, Parke, on the higher education of women, iii, 433.
Goodell, Lavinia, iii, 648.
Goodrich, Sarah Knox, iii, 765.
Gordon, J. W., i, 307.
Gordon, Laura DeForce, iii, 6, 751—Lectures, iii, 755—Letter to Washington Convention, iii, 64—Senator, nominated for, iii, 756.
Gougar, Helen M., iii, 540, 552, 697, 702, 708, 857.
Government, Hooker on, ii, 475—Paine on, ii, 474—Pillsbury on, ii, 201—Priestly on, ii, 476—Radical basis of, ii, 290—Sharpe, Granville, on, ii, 475—Summers, Lord, on, ii, 475—theory, true, ii, 474.
"Grace Greenwood" (*see* Mrs. Sara J Lippincott).
GRANT, U. S., ii, 88—campaign (1872), Tremont Temple meeting, iii, 278—XV. Amendment, on the, ii, 646—talk with Susan B. Anthony, ii, 544
Grant and Wilson campaign, National Woman's Rights Association's appeal, ii, 517.
Graves, Ezra, ii, 282, 307.
GREAT BRITAIN, ii, 202; iii, 833—associations formed, iii, 841—circular to Members of Parliament, iii, 881—Conference, Edinburgh, iii, 878—Conference, Leeds, iii, 874—Conference, St. James' Hall, iii, 888—demonstration, Birmingham, iii, 868—demonstration, Manchester, iii, 867—demonstrations, iii, 869—education act, iii, 850—education bill, Scotch, iii, 851—household suffrage, iii, 886—Isle of Man, iii, 870—letters, woman suffrage, iii, 865—Manchester Liberal Association, iii, 876—married women's property act, iii, 872—medical relief bill, iii, 890—meetings during 1870, iii, 852—memorial of the Birmingham conference, iii, 855—memorial to Gladstone, iii, 883—memorials, iii, 853, 854, 873—municipal franchise bill, iii, 845—municipal franchise bill for Scotland, iii, 871—Northern Reform Society, iii, 838—Parliament debates woman suffrage, iii, 850, 861, 862, 863, 873, 884, 889, 890—petitions, iii, 866—petitions and pamphlets, iii, 840—petition to Parliament, Mary Smith's, iii, 835—reform act, ii, 590—Sheffield Association, iii, 837—suffrage bill before Parliament, iii, 842—chronological table of successive steps towards freedom, iii, 980—women householders, iii, 881—women in politics, iii, 835—woman suffrage, able advocates of, iii, 836—women suffrage meeting, first ever held in London, iii, 848—*Woman Suffrage Journal*, iii, 850—women vote, iii, 843—women vote in Scotland, iii, 871.
Greece, iii, 919.
Greeley, Ann F., iii, 356.
GREELEY, Horace, ii, 227; iii, 408, 773—abolitionists, denounced, ii, 287—bullet and ballot, ii, 284—defranchisement, panacea for, ii, 101—enfranchisement of women, on, ii, 103—Kansas campaign, ii, 230—letter to Susan B. Anthony, i, 628—letter to Cleveland National Convention, i, 125—letter to Paulina W. Davis, i, 520—letter to Mrs. J. S. Griffing, ii, 36—letter to Sam'l J. May on woman's rights, i, 653—marriage, on, i, 730—marriage and divorce, on, i, 740—Owen, R. D., discussion, divorce, i, 296, 746—Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, and, ii, 287—support of, lost, ii, 269—temperance speech, Metropolitan Hall, i, 491—universal suffrage and universal amnesty, ii, 315—woman and work, on, i, 589—woman suffrage, opposed to, iii, 185—woman suffrage, report against, ii, 285—criticism, *New York Independent*, ii, 305.
Greeley's, Mrs., petition, ii, 287.
Green, Anna R., Md., iii, 815.
Green, Beriah, i, 417—speech at Cooper Institute Convention, i, 699, 450, 487.
Gregory, Samuel, i, 38.
Grew, Rev. Henry, on woman's rights, i, 379.
Grew, Mary, i, 325—speech at Cooper Institute Convention, i, 735—woman suffrage, on, ii, 814—President, iii, 457.
GRIFFING, Josephine S., i, 110; ii, 345, 422; iii, 810—Freedman's Aid Association, letter to Lucretia Mott, ii, 869—Freedman's Bureau, originator of, ii, 38—Freedman's Relief Association, ii, 26—letter to Horace Greeley, ii, 36—letter to Lucretia Mott, ii, 33—letter to Catharine F. Stebbins, ii, 874—report 1871, ii, 484—"Shirley Dare," on, ii, 30—speech, Equal Rights Association, ii, 221—testimonials of Congressmen, ii, 33—tribute from Wm. Lloyd Garrison, ii, 38.
GRIMKÉ, Angelina, i, 39, 52—anecdotes, by her husband, i, 402—letter to Wm. Lloyd Garrison, i, 397—sketch of "E. C. S.," i, 392—speech against slavery, i, 334.
GRIMKÉ, Sarah Moore, i, 39, 53, 406—letter, West Chester, Pa., Convention, i, 353.
Grover, A. J., iii, 560, 591.
Guardianship law, i, 749.
Gurney, Samuel, i, 421.

Digitized by Google

Guthrie, Clara Merrick, iii, 790.
Guthrie, Mrs., daughter of Frances Wright, ii, 543.

H.

Haggerty, James, ii, 210, iii, 434.
Hale, Sarah Josepha, i, 45, 388.
Hall, Israel, ii, 377.
Hall, Mary, admission to the Bar, iii, 330.
Halleck, Sarah H., ii, 60.
Hallock, Frances V., ii, 435.
Halstead, Murat, iii, 593.
Hamilton, Alexander, ii, 413.
Hamlin, Senator, ii, 411.
Hampden Society, iii, 270.
Hanaford, Phebe, ii, 398, 791; iii, 327, 479, 481.
Hancock, Gen. W. S., iii, 185, 431.
Hanna, Laura, iii, 720.
HARBERT, Elizabeth Boynton, iii, 560, 592, 621—delegate to Republican National Convention, iii, 26—oration, iii, 581—speech before Congressional committee, iii, 76.
Harberton, Lady, speech at Edinburgh, iii, 879.
Hare, Thomas, ii, 292.
Harper, Frances E. W., ii, 838.
Harrington, Mary L., iii, 374.
Harris, Sarah, ii, 376.
Hartford Courant, iii, 322.
Hartford Times, ii, 538.
Harvard Annex, iii, 294.
Haskell, Mehitable, Worcester Convention, i, 232; iii, 286.
Hatch, Junius, "pin-cushion ministry," i, 539.
Hatton, Frank, iii, 617.
Haven, Gilbert, ii, 388; iii, 268, 528, 620; ii, 839, 398, 840.
Havens, E. O., iii, 526 428.
Haviland, Laura C., iii, 532.
Hawley, Jos. R., letter to Mrs. Stanton, iii, 28, 30, 90.
HAY, William, letter to Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 655—letter to Susan B. Anthony, i, 631—letter to *The North Star*, on the Saratoga Convention, i, 621; paper, property rights, 607.
Hayes, R. B., iii, 165.
Hayhurst, Martha, i, 348.
Hazard, Rebecca N., ii, 855, iii, 604.
Hazlett, Adelle, ii, 787; iii, 522.
Heath, Jeannette Brown, i, 642.
Heloise, i, 759.
Henderson, Miss A. M., iii, 654.
Henderson, Senator, ii, 98.
Heroism, Kate Shelly, iii, 633.
Herricourt, Madame, ii, 569, 395.
Hertell's, Barbara, will, i, 63.
Hewitt, Rev. Dr., i, 502.
Heyrick, Elizabeth, i, 41.
Heywood, E. H., ii, 222.
Hiatt, Hannah, i, 306.
Hiatt, Sarah W., iii, 803.
Hicks, Elias, i, 412, 415.
HIGGINSON, Thos. Wentworth, iii, 275, 277, 305—Brick Church meeting, i, 500—coëducation, on, iii, 496—Kansas campaign, ii, 265—Kansas campaign, ii, 237—letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 917—letter to Cleveland National Convention, i, 131—letter to Lucy Stone, i, 566—marriage ceremony, on, i, 260—Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, i, 253—*New York Times*, on the, i, 648—speech, in Cleveland, O., ii, 802—speech, in Cooper Institute, ii, 828—speech, Broadway Tabernacle Convention, at, i, 656—speech, Cleveland Convention, ii, 760, 771—speech, National Convention, New York, i, 642—voters, qualification of, i, 249—temperance and woman suffrage, on, ii, 819—theological discussion, i, 647—woman's rights almanac, i, 863—women in Christian civilization, on, i, 791.
Hilda, Abbess, i, 30.
Hill, Benj. H., speech, iii, 217.
Hill, Charlotte, iii, 365.
Hill, Peter, iii, 524.
Hillier, C. J., iii, 756.
Hinckley, Frederick A., on woman suffrage in Rhode Island, iii, 349—speech at Washington Convention, iii, 222.
Hindman, Matilda, iii, 459, 522, 621, 719, 723.
HOAR, Geo. F., minority report, iii, 131, —presents petitions, iii, 104—letter to Washington Convention, ii, 858—speech, women in the Supreme Court, iii, 139—select committee, U. S. Senate, iii, 198–216—speech in 1871, ii, 820.
Hobart's, Ella F., services as chaplain in Union army, ii, 18.
Hobbs, Lucy B., dentist, iii, 401, 455.
Holland, J. G., iii, 46.
Holloway, Wm. R., iii, 534.
Homeopathic College, ii, 765.
Holland, iii, 907.
Holmes, Jennie F., iii, 683.
Holmes, Rev., iii, 390.
Hook, Frances, as a soldier, ii, 19.
HOOKER, Isabella B. iii, 194, 327—argument before House Judiciary committee, iii, 103—before Senate committee, iii, 105—declaration and pledge, ii, 486—letter to New York Convention, twenty-fifth anniversary, ii, 534—police, how she would rule,, iii, 73—receptions in Washington, iii, 99—reminiscences of, iii, 320—report, National Association, 1872, ii, 496—speech before House Judiciary committee, ii, 458—speech before Senate Judiciary committee, ii, 499—thanks the champions of woman's rights in Congress, ii, 489—Washington Convention, notes ii, 425.

Digitized by Google

Hooker, John, iii, 101, 327, 957.
Hopkins, E. A., on legal grievance of women, i, 584.
Hosmer, Harriet, iii, 143, 301, 595, 951.
Hospital clinics, iii, 448.
Houghton, Agnes A., iii, 359.
Hovey, Charles F., i, 625—Bequests, i, 257, 258, 667.
Howe, Frederick B., iii, 438.
Howe, J. H., on women as jurors, iii, 736.
HOWE, Julia Ward, ii, 757, 770, 792, 873, portrait, 783; iii, 270, 275, 276, 371—Fifteenth Amendment, on the, ii, 335—President of Am. Woman Suffrage Association, made, ii 834—Speech in Philadelphia, ii, 817; in Detroit, 834—Woman Suffrage in New Jersey, on, ii, 847.
Hoyt, John W., Gov. of Wyoming, iii, 241, 474, 730.
Hoyt, Mrs., on anti-slavery and woman's rights, ii, 59, 61, 63.
Howitt, Wm., letter to Lucretia Mott, i, 434.
Howland, Emily, i, 688.
Howland, Fannie, description of Washington Convention, ii, 416.
Howland, William, iii, 437.
Hubbard, R. D., iii, 326.
Hugo, Victor, ii, 369, iii, 75, 127.
Hulett, Alta C., iii, 572.
"Human Rights," Hurlbut's, i, 38.
HUNT, Harriot K., i, 219, 224, 255, 356, 531, 535, ii, 583—medical education, on, i, 356—physician, as a, i, 260—speech at Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 564—taxation, protest against, i, 259, iii, 298.
Hunt's, Ward, Judge, decision Anthony trial, ii, 689—resolution against, ii, 537.
Hunt's, Richard, tea table, i, 68.
Hunt, Seth, iii, 270.
Hurlbut's "Human Rights," i, 38.
Husband and wife, act concerning rights and liabilities of, i, 686.
Hussey, Cornelia Collins, iii, 482.
Husted, James W., favors suffrage for women, iii, 409, 417, 424, 437.
Hutchinson family, ii, 59, 239, 262, 309, 542, 934; iii, 35—Letter, John W., i, 627.
Hutchinson, Anne, i, 206.
Hutchinson, Nellie, iii, 752.

I.

ILLINOIS, iii, 559—Art Union, iii, 587—Bar, Myra Bradwell's application, ii, 601—opinion denying, ii, 609—Carpenter's, Matt. H., argument, ii, 615—opinion of Justice Bradley, ii, 624—report of proceedings in Illinois and U. S. Supreme Courts, ii, 614—U. S. Supreme Court decision, ii, 622—writ of error, ii, 614—centennial celebration at Evanston, iii, 581—Conventions (see conventions)—Elmwood church trouble, iii, 563—Garrett Biblical Institute, iii, 582—houses of ill-fame, licensing Chicago, iii, 572—married women's earnings act, iii, 570—Master in Chancery, Mrs. Schuchardt, iii, 588—Moline Association, iii, 589—Monticello Ladies Seminary, iii, 579—petitions, toils of circulating, iii, 590—pulpit utterances, iii, 564—Social Science Association, iii, 584—Suffrage Association formed, iii, 569—suffrage society, first, iii, 560—temperance petition, iii, 587—Woman's College at Evanston, iii, 578—woman, as preacher, first in, iii, 579—women elected as school officers, iii, 575—women eligible as school officers, bill making, iii, 575—women, trials and triumphs of, iii, 560.
Impeachment, articles of, iii, 31.
INDIANA, i, 290, iii, 533—appendix, iii, 965—campaign of 1882, iii, 543—colleges open to women, iii, 548—constitutional debates, i, 296—Conventions (see Conventions)—electoral bill, iii, 541—Equal Suffrage Society Indianapolis, iii, 536—laws for women, changes in, iii, 544—legislative enactments, iii, 544—legislative hearings, iii, 538—liquor law, i, 307—mass meeting in Indianapolis, iii, 541—newspapers, iii, 555—Republican State Convention, iii, 542—secret conclave, iii, 535—temperance petition, Mrs. Wallace, iii, 539—women in schools, iii, 547.
Infidelity, i, 143.
International Convention, iii, 157, 585, 896, 952.
IOWA, iii, 612—churches indorse woman suffrage, iii, 620—Clergymen's tract, iii, 624—Conventions (see Conventions)—Fort Dodge, iii, 617—friendly associations, iii, 635—Governor Kirkwood appoints women to office, iii, 626—Governor, first, to recognize woman suffrage, iii, 622—Governor Sherman interviewed, iii, 624—Inventions by women, iii, 632—Journalism, iii, 629—laws, improvement in, iii, 636—lectures, iii, 630—Legislative action, iii, 619—Legislative action, summary, iii, 625—mass meeting at the capitol, iii, 619—medical profession, iii, 631—Polk County Society, iii, 614—Republican Convention, women's plank, iii, 620—County School Superintendents, Attorney General's opinion, iii, 627—school offices, eligibility of women to hold, iii, 628—societies organized, iii, 615, 617—*State Register*, iii, 620—women in office, iii, 626—women employed as teachers, iii, 627—woman suffrage, first agitation of, iii, 613—woman suffrage society,

Digitized by Google

first, iii, 614—women in positions of trust, iii, 616.
Island No. 10, ii, 10.
Italy, iii, 899.

J.

Janney's, Mrs. R. A. S., recollections, i, 122.
Jay, John, ii, 413.
Jackson, Rev. E. M., i, 502.
Jackson, Francis, i, 189, 257, 634, 667, 743, will case, iii, 310.
Jackson, James C., ii, 582.
Jackson, Mercy B., letter, ii, 920.
Jenkins, Lydia Ann, i, 145.
Jerry, rescue trials, i, 474.
Johnson, Andrew, ii, 205.
Johnson, Mariana, i, 103, 351.
Johnson, Oliver, i, 101, 367, 671; ii, 786, 813.
Johnson, Rev. Samuel, letter to National Convention in New York, i, 635.
Johnson, Wm. H. and Mary, letter to Westchester, Pa., Convention, i, 832.
Jones, Mrs. E. C., Jailoress, iii, 488.
Jones, Jane Graham, delegate to National Convention at Washington, ii, 522, 442; iii, 229, 580—address International Congress at Paris, iii, 585—Genevieve Graham, daughter, iii, 586, 897.
Jones, J. Elizabeth, report, i, 168—speech at Cooper Institute Convention, i, 694—speech at Syracuse National Convention, i, 530.
Journalism, women in, i, 43, iii, 303, 629, 761, 813.
Judge direct a verdict of guilty, can a, ii, 690.
Julian, Geo. W., ii, 333, 489, 490, 552, 727—amendment to District of Columbia suffrage bill, ii, 282—speech on woman suffrage, ii, 801.
Juries, venerable decisions on, ii, 705.
Jury, women on, iii, 732.
Justice of Peace, Mrs. Esther Morris made, iii, 731.

K.

Kalamazoo college, iii, 525.
KANSAS, Mrs. Nichols' account, i, 185, iii, 696—appeal, ii, 247—campaign, 1867, ii, 928—campaign, S. N. Wood's summing up of, ii, 254—*Champion* (Atchison) on woman suffrage, ii, 240—*Commercial*, (Leavenworth) on the campaign, ii, 262—constitutional amendment to strike word "white" from suffrage clause, ii, 229—Conventions (see Conventions)—elections, iii, 701, 708—Harvey, Governor, message, iii, 696—legislative action, iii, 709—Lincoln suffrage association, iii, 701—Lincoln Auxiliary of the National Association, iii, 698—parties in convention, action of, iii, 707—press, iii, 699—property rights, iii, 704—Radical Reform Christian Association, iii, 703—reminiscences, Helen Ekin Starrett's, ii, 250—schools, iii, 706—Stanton Suffrage Society organized, iii, 702—suffrage organizations, history of, iii, 698—suffrage song, the Hutchinsons, ii, 934—Superintendent of Public Instruction, Sarah A. Brown nominated, iii, 705—suppressed proceedings, ii, 931—Temperance Convention, ii, 231—woman suffrage facts, iii, 709—woman suffrage indorsed by Republican State Convention, iii, 707—woman suffrage petitions, report of Judiciary Franchise Committee, i, 194—Women's Christian Temperance Union, iii, 703—Women's Impartial Suffrage Association, address, ii, 932—women run for office, iii, 708—women in office, iii, 706—women in the professions, iii, 706.
Kasson, John A., iii, 619.
Keating, Harriette C., iii, 791.
Kelley, W. D., suffrage resolution, iii, 71.
Kelly, Abby (*see Foster*).
Kemble, Fanny, i, 412.
KENTUCKY, iii, 818—architecture, Miss White, iii, 820—education, facilities for, iii, 821—Louisville School of Pharmacy, iii, 821—woman suffrage society, ii, 862—school suffrage, i, 869, iii, 821.
King, Susan A., sketch of, iii, 420.
King, Thos. Star, i, 666.
Kingman, Judge, Kansas, i, 192.
Kingman, J. W., ii, 836, iii, 727, 241.
Kingsbury, Benjamin, iii, 359.
Kingsbury Elizabeth A., ii, 310, iii, 476.
Kingsley, Henry, letter to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 438.
Kirk, Mrs. Eleanor (Nellie Ames), ii, 390.
Knight, Ann, i, 438, iii, 837.
Knowlton, Helen M., iii, 302.

L.

Ladies' Art Association, iii, 399.
Lander, Mrs. Dick, iii, 852.
Lane, James H., i, 191.
Langdon, Lady Anna G., iii, 854.
Lapham, Elbridge G., presents petition, ii, 283—votes for, ii, 304—Anthony trial, ii, 647—printing speeches in the House, iii, 174—vote in Senate, iii, 218—Senate committee, 228, 231—Senate report, 232—thanks to, iii, 252.
Lawrence, Amos A., iii, 330.
Lawrence, Sybil, iii, 532.
Lawyers, women, iii, 575.
Lee, Mary B., legacy, iii, 624.
Leftwich, i, 649.
Legacy, iii, 624.
Leipsic, iii, 902.
Leslie, Mrs. Frank, iii, 441.
Lester, Louise, iii, 780.
LETTERS: Alcott, Louisa May, to Lucy Stone, ii, 831—Amberly, Lady, to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 439—Andrews, Mar-

Digitized by Google

garet H., to S. J. May, i, 531—Anthony, H. B., to S. B. Anthony, iii, 350.
Letters, Anthony, Susan B., to her family: Boston Convention, i, 256; to Brooks, James, ii, 97; to Foote, E. B., ii, 941; to Garfield, iii, 185; to Mott, Lydia, i, 748; to National Democratic Convention, ii, 340; to Wright, Martha C., i, 676.
Letters, Barton, Clara, to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 916—Bascom, E. C., to S. B. Anthony, iii, 647—Becker, Lydia E., to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 62—Beecher, H. W., to St. Louis Convention, ii, 825—Bennett, Alice, to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 472—National Association to Berlin Congress, ii, 404—Briggs, Caroline A., to S. B. Anthony, iii, 250—Blackwell Elizabeth, to Emily Collins, i, 91—Blackwell, Antoinette Brown, to Cooper Institute Convention, i, 862—Blackwell, Elizabeth, to Westchester, Pa., Convention, i, 831—Blackwell, H. B., to E. C. Stanton, ii, 232, 235—Blair, Henry W., to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 380—Bowles, Samuel, to Mrs. Hooker, iii, 325—Bright, Jacob, to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 438—Brown, Olympia, to S. B. Anthony, ii, 259—Bruhn, Rosa, to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 439—Burleigh, Celia, giving account of Saratoga Convention, ii, 402—Burns, Alexander, to Des Moines Convention, iii, 618—Burr, Frances E., to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 912, iii, 334—Butler, Benjamin F., to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 539, iii, 255.
Letters: Carpenter, C. C., to Iowa W. S. Association, iii, 621—Carpenter, M. H., to Elizabeth C. Stanton, ii, 423—Channing, Wm. Henry, Cleveland National Convention, i, 129—Child, L. Maria, to St. Louis Convention, ii, 825; E. C. Stanton, ii, 910—Clemmer, Mary, to Senator Wadleigh, iii, 111; to S. B. Anthony, iii, 262—Cobbe, Frances P., to Paulina W. Davis, ii, 438—Cole M. M., to H. B. Blackwell, ii, 832—Colvin A. J., to Susan B. Anthony, i, 691, 750; ii, 914—Corner, Mary T., to Mrs. Bloomer, i, 122—Corson, Hiram, to Susan B. Anthony, ii,, 472—Cutler, Mrs. H. M. T., to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 915—Dall, Caroline H., to *The Nation*, ii, 101—Darlington, Hannah M., to Mrs. Stanton, i, 344—Deroine, Jeanne, to women of America, i, 234—Dickinson, Anna E., to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 916—Douglass, Fred., to E. Cady Stanton, ii, 328—Faithful, Emily, to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 440—Fields, James T., to H. B. Blackwell, ii, 838—Folger, Charles J., to Susan B. Anthony, i, 750—Foster, Rachel G., to *Our Herald*, iii, 243—Freedman's Relief Association, on, ii, 35—Fremont, Jessie B. to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 911.
Letters: Gage, Frances D., to Cincinnati Convention, ii, 857; Steinway Hall Convention, ii, 769; Gage, M. E. J., to, i, 47; Rochester Temperance Convention, i, 845; Stone, Lucy, i, 656; Washington Convention, ii, 424—Gage, M. J., to Mrs. Dahlgren, ii, 494; to Omaha Con., ii, 250; to women of Dakota, iii, 663—Garfield, James A., to S. B. Anthony, iii, 185—Garrison, Wm. Lloyd, to American Woman Suffrage Association meeting in Philadelphia, ii, 816; to Third Decade Convention, Rochester, iii, 123; to Concord Convention, iii, 368—Geddes, George, to M. J. Gage, i, 64—*Greeley*, Horace, to Susan B. Anthony, i, 628; Cleveland National Convention, i, 125; Davis, Paulina W., i, 520; Marsh, Rev. John, i, 503; May, S. J., on woman's rights, i, 653. Severance, Mrs. C. M., i, 125—*Griffing*, Josephine S., to Catharine A. F. Stebbins, ii, 874; to Greeley, ii, 36—Grimké, Angelina, to Wm. Lloyd Garrison, i, 397—Grimké, Sarah M., to Westchester, Pa., Convention, i, 353—Grover, A. J., to Mrs. Stanton, i, 591.
Letters: Hay, Wm., to Susan B. Anthony, i, 631; Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 655—Higginson, T. W., to S. B. Anthony, ii, 917; Cleveland (Nat.) Convention, i, 131—Hooker, Isabella B., to Susan B. Anthony, i, 535; to Mrs. Dahlgren, iii, 100; Stone, Lucy, i, 566—Howitt, Wm., to Lucretia Mott, i, 434—Hugo, Victor, to Clemence S. Lozier, iii, 75—Johnson, Samuel, National Convention in New York, i, 635—Johnson, Wm. H. and Mary, to Westchester, Pa., Convention, i, 832—Kingman, J. W., to Lucy Stone, ii, 836—Kingsley, Henry, to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 438—Lawrence, Amos A., to Abby Smith, iii, 330—Leo, Andre, to Second Decade meeting, ii, 439—Livermore, Mary A., to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 921.
Letters: Manderson, C. F., to O. C. Dinsmoor, iii, 688—Marsh, J., to Horace Greeley, i, 503—Marsh, L. R., to Mrs. E.C. Stanton, ii, 922—Martineau, Harriet, to P. W. Davis, i, 229—Mott, Lucretia, i, 437—Mayo, A. D., to Syracuse Con., i, 851—Mendenhall, H. S., to Dr. Avery, iii, 724—Meriman, Emelia J., to the Second Decade meeting, ii, 451—Mill, John Stuart, to Paulina W. Davis, i, 220, ii, 419; to S. N. Wood, ii, 252—Miller, Francis, to S. B. Anthony, ii, 536—Mills, Chas. D. B., to Mrs. Matilda J. Gage, ii, 424—Mott, Lucretia, to Daniel O'Connell, i, 432; to Josephine S. Griffing, ii, 873; to

Digitized by Google

Salem, Ohio, Convention. i, 812—Mott, Lydia, to Susan B. Anthony, i, 630—Mott, Mary, to Westchester, Pa., Convention, i, 829.
Letters: *New York Tribune*, on, canvass of 1859-'60, i, 677—Nichols, Mrs. C. I. H., to Rochester Tem. Convention, i, 847—Owen, Robert Dale, to Susan B. Anthony, i, 292—Pastoral, i, 81—Phelps, Almira L., to Mrs. Hooker, iii, 100—Phelps, Elizabeth Stuart, to Am. W. S. Association meeting in Cooper In., ii, 831—Phillips, Wendell, to S. B. Anthony, iii, 62; to Third Decade Convention at Rochester, N. Y., iii, 122—Pickler, J. A., to Matilda J. Gage, iii, 668—Pomeroy, C. R., to Des Moines Convention, iii, 618—Post, Amy, to S. B. Anthony, iii, 48—Pugh, Sarah, to Salem, Ohio, Convention, i, 814—Rose, Ernestine L., to Susan B. Anthony, i, 98; ii, 423; iii, 50, 120; to Mrs. J. S. Griffing, ii, 356—Russell, Lucinda, to Harriet S. Brooks, iii, 682.
Letters: Sanford, R. M., to Cleveland Con., i, 819—Sargent, A. A., to Third Decade Con., iii, 121; to Omaha Con., iii, 245—Sargent, J. T., to E. C. Stan- ii, 911—Saxon, Elizabeth L., to Mrs. Minor, iii, 791—Severance, Caroline M., to Mrs. E. C. Stanton, ii, 911—Shaw, Sarah B., to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 239—Smith, Gerrit, to Susan B. Anthony, i, 497; ii, 317, 538, 941; Garrison, Wm. L., i, 223, 620; Stanton, E. Cady, i, 708, 836; St. Louis Convention, ii, 825—Somerville, Mary, to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 440—Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, to Akron, O., Convention, i, 815; Cooper Institute Con., i, 860; Greeley, Horace, i, 738; Mott, Lucretia, iii, 45; Omaha Convention, iii, 244; Salem, O., Convention, i, 810; Smith, Gerrit, i, 839; Syracuse Convention, i, 848—Stanton, Harriot, to Nebraska voters, iii, 247—Stebbins, Catharine A. F., to Lucretia Mott, iii, 47—Stone, Lucy, to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 237, 919; to Elizabeth C. Stanton, ii, 234; to Salem, O., Convention, i, 813.
Letters: Taylor, Mrs. M., to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 438—Tenney, Mrs. R. S., to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 257—Tilton, Theo., to American Woman Suffrage Association, ii, 770—Wade, Benjamin F., to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 117, to Josephine Sophie Griffing, ii, 35—Wallace, Zerelda G., to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 257—Wattles, Susan E. to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 255—Weber, Helene M., to M. A. Spofford, i, 822—Weld, Angelina G., on organizations, i, 540—Whiting, N. H., letter to Cooper Institute Convention, i, 861—Winder, R. B., to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 817—Wright, Elizur, to Paulina W. Davis, i, 217—Wright, Henry C., to Garrison, i, 310—Wright, Martha C., to Pillsbury, ii, 240.
Lewis, Ida, iii, 347.
Lily, The, i, 486.
Lincoln (Kansas) *Beacon*, *Lincoln* (Kansas) *Register*, iii, 699.
Lippincott, Sarah J., i, 46—Saxe's poems, on, i, 828 — Washington Convention (Nat.), description of, ii, 359
List, Charles, address at Worcester National Convention, i, 232.
Little, Knox, iii, 471—sermon to women, i, 728.
Livermore, Mary A., ii, 777; iii, 268, 274, 279, 388, 561, 565, 570.
Livingston, William, i, 441.
LOCKWOOD, Belva A., ii, 522, 240, 443, 523, 537, 585; iii, 64, 177, 809, 811, 818—attempted to vote, iii, 813—admitted to U. S. Supreme Court, iii, 141—brief to U. S. Senate, on women as lawyers, iii, 106 — motion to admit Lowry to Supreme Court, iii, 174—speech in Dr. Furness' Church, iii, 35—women's rights, the way to get, iii, 73.
Logan, John A., on woman suffrage, iii, 207.
Longfellow, Samuel, speech at Cooper Institute Convention, i, 711
Lord, Mrs. A., iii, 703.
Loring, Geo. B., iii, 154.
Lords, feudal, i, 760, 762.
Loud, Huldah B., iii, 279.
Loughary, Mrs. H. A., iii, 774.
LOUISIANA, Constitutional Convention, iii, 789—married women, laws relating to, iii, 799—press, iii, 798—St. Anna's Asylum, iii, 789—schools, physiology in, iii, 797—women eligible to school offices, iii, 795—women's club, iii, 796.
Love, Mary F., i, 583, 587, 589 (See Davis, Mary F.).
Lovering, J. F., iii, 371.
Lowell, Jas. R., poem "Endurance," iii, 695.
Lowell, Josephine Shaw, appointed to office, i, 473; police matrons, iii, 432—Com'r of Charities, made a, iii, 417.
Lozier, Clemence S., M. D., iii, 405—sketch of, iii, 411, 416, 421—presided, 425—seats for shop girls, 433—protest against District Attorney Russell, 436—appeal to voters, 437.
Lukens, Esther Ann, i, 311.
Lunt's, Bishop, defence of polygamy, i, 776.
Luther, Martin, will of, i, 358.
Luther and polygamy, i, 775, 776.
Lyford, Rev. C. P., on polygamy, i, 778.
Lynn, Eliza, i, 34.

Digitized by Google

M.

Macaulay, Catharine Sawbridge, i, 32, 790.
McCarthy, Justin, iii, 864.
McClellan, Geo. B., ii, 42, 75.
McClintock, Thomas, i, 539.
McClintock, Mary Ann, i, 67, iii, 454.
McCook, Edward, on suffrage, iii, 713.
McCook, Mrs. Mary, 715—tribute, 718.
McDonald, Joseph E., women to the Supreme Court, iii, 111, 139, 155—moves Standing Committee, iii, 190—tribute, iii, 553.
McDowell, Anna E., *Woman's Advocate*, i, 388—*Sunday Dispatch*, iii, 446—J. Edgar Thomson's will, iii, 468—Rev. Knox Little, iii, 471.
McDowell, Gertrude, iii, 693.
Mackey, T. J., iii, 828.
McLaren, Mrs. Duncan, iii, 842—portrait, iii, 849; 951.
McLaren, Charles, Mr. and Mrs., iii, 927.
McLaren, Walter, iii, 874, 936.
McRae, Emma M., argument before House committee, iii, 161.
Madison, James, ii, 632.
Mahan, Asa, i, 151—argument at Cleveland National Convention, i, 133.
MAINE, iii, 351—Bar, admissions to, iii, 355—conventions (see Conventions)—faithful friends, iii, 365—Goddard, Judge, iii, 353—Industrial School for girls, iii, 356—legislation, iii, 357, 364—married women, law, iii, 352—"Moral Eminence of Maine," iii, 359—suffrage society, first, iii, 352—women holding office, Supreme Judicial Court opinion, iii, 361—women in office, Gov Dingley's message, iii, 363—women on school committees, iii, 351—woman suffrage, progress made, 1873, iii, 357—women tax-payers protest, iii, 356.
"Male" in the Constitution, ii, 91.
Manderson, Charles F., iii, 678—letter to O. C. Dinsmoor, iii, 688.
Mandeville, Dr., i, 486.
Manikin, i, 37.
Mann, Horace, i, 356.
Mansfield, Arabella A., case of, ii, 606.
Manufactures in hands of women, i, 291.
Marcet, Jane, i, 34.
"Maria" and "Old Betty," ii, 114.
Marriage amendment act, English, ii, 293.
Marriage a cause of disfranchisement, ii, 621.
Marriage and minority disabilities, ii, 603.
Marriage, "Mrs. Schlachtfeld," on, iii, 723.
Marriage, what is legal status of, ii, 456.
MARRIAGE QUESTION: Church views, i, 758—devils, with, i, 769—Greek church, under, i, 773—heterogeneous, i, 719—law, i, 107—law of 1860, i, 686—protest, Robert Dale Owen's, i, 295—protest, Lucy Stone's, i, 260—relations, i, 293—Rose, Ernestine L., on, i, 237.
MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE: Anthony, Susan B., on, i, 735—bill before New York Legislature, i, 745—Blackwell, Antoinette B., on, i, 723—drunkenness, for, i, 485—Garrison, Wm. Lloyd, on, i, 733—Greeley, Horace, on, i, 740—Greeley-Owen discussion, i, 296, 746—law amended in Massachusetts, i, 211—Mott, Lucretia, on, i, 746—Phillips, Wendell, on, i, 732—Rose, Ernestine L., on, i, 729—Stanton, Elizabeth Cady, on, i, 716—Stanton, Mrs., letter to Horace Greeley on, i, 738.
Marriages solemnized by women, iii, 301.
Marquette, i, 762.
Marsh, John, letter to Horace Greeley, i, 503.
Marsh, Luther R., iii, 408—letter to Mrs. E. C. Stanton, ii, 922.
"Martian Statutes," i, 31.
Martin, John A., ii, 249.
MARTINEAU, Harriet, i, 34; iii, 854—letter to Pauline W. Davis, i, 229—letters to Lucretia Mott, i, 437.
MARYLAND, iii, 814—Baltimore Dental Surgery, iii, 817—Equal Rights Society, iii, 815.
Mason, O. P., iii, 683, 691.
MASSACHUSETTS, i, 201, iii, 265—Association, anniversary, iii, 272—association, work done, iii, 269—conventions (see Conventions)—Democratic Convention, action, iii, 278—divorce law amended, i, 211—Governors, action of, iii, 287—Grant campaign, Tremont Temple meeting, iii, 278—Harvard Annex, iii, 294—Legislative, action, iii, 284—Legislature, petition before, i, 258—New England Women's Club, iii, 304—petitions, iii, 274, 285—Philosophy at Concord, School of, iii, 307—prohibitionists, alliance with, iii, 280—Republican Convention, action, iii, 277, 278—school committees, women, iii, 290—school suffrage, iii, 280, 288—suffrage associations, iii, 273—Supreme Court decisions, iii, 290—women in the civil service, iii, 306—women delegates to Republican Convention, iii, 277—women opposed to suffrage, iii, 275—women at the polls, iii, 282—women, social condition, iii, 294—woman suffrage political party, iii, 276—woman suffrage ticket, iii, 281.
Mather, Cotton, iii, 303.
Maule, Mollie K., iii, 693.
Maxwell, Lily, iii, 842.
May, Joseph, iii, 34.
MAY, Samuel J., i, 40, 485, 518; ii, 418, 422—"Colored," on the word, ii, 215—Kansas campaign, ii, 265—President

Digitized by Google

Rochester Convention, made, i, 578—speech at American Equal Rights Association meeting, ii, 191—speech on temperance, i, 478.
Mayo, A. D., letter to Syracuse Convention, i, 851.
Medical, iii, 299, 549.
Medical College, first opened to women, i, 88, 389.
Medical Education, Harriot K. Hunt on, i, 356.
Medical profession, i, 37—Iowa women, iii, 631.
Meetings (see Conventions).
Memorials, ii, 226, 497; iii, 130, 480, 517, 539, 855—Democratic Party, iii, 182—Gladstone, iii, 883—Greenback Convention, iii, 180—Ohio Constitutional Convention, i, 105—Republican Party, iii, 177—Woodhull, Victoria C., ii, 443—Legislatures, i, 673.
Mendenhall, Mrs. H. S., letter to Dr. Avery, iii, 724.
Meriman, Emelia J., letter to Second Decade meeting, ii, 441.
Meriwether, Elizabeth A., iii, 27, 154, 822.
Merrick, Caroline E., iii, 789—women as school officers, iii, 795.
Merrick, Mrs. E. T., speech, Louisiana Constitutional Convention, iii, 792.
Merrill, Catharine, iii, 548.
Merrimon, Senator, on the Pembina Territory bill, ii, 552–560.
Merritt, Paulina, T., iii, 540.
Methodists and women preachers, i, 784.
MICHIGAN, iii, 513—churches, attitude of, iii, 521—constitutional amendment, iii, 518; lost, iii, 522—Conventions (see Conventions)—Episcopal Church bill, iii, 529—legislative action, iii, 516—local societies, iii, 529—memorial, iii, 517—Northwestern Association, iii, 516—State Suffrage Society, iii, 515—University, iii, 525—State University, Ann Arbor, opened to girls, iii, 525—vote for woman suffrage, iii, 522—women's literary clubs and libraries, iii, 513—women voting in Sturgis, iii, 514.
Middlesex society, iii, 270.
Miles, Nelson A., iii, 779.
MILL, John Stuart, ii, 341, 378, 727, 833—death of, iii, 853—Fifteenth Amendment, on the, ii, 334—"Household Suffrage Bill" amendment, ii, 182—Letter to Paulina W. Davis, i, 220; ii, 419—letter to S. N. Wood, ii, 252—women government, on, iii, 77.
MILL, Mrs. John Stuart, essay, i, 225.
Miller, Francis, argument, ii, 523—Argument Spencer-Webster suit, ii, 595—letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 536.
Mills, Chas. D. B., letter to M. J. Gage, ii, 424; ii, 915.
Milton, John, i, 779, 780.
Ministers, charges against, i, 135.
MINNESOTA, iii, 648—Appendix: Early friends, iii, 973; school officers, 973; authors and poets, iii, 974; graduates from State University, iii, 974; teachers and professors, iii, 975; medical profession, benevolent institutions, painters in oil and water colors, iii, 976; musical clubs, speakers and writers, iii, 977—coëducation, iii, 656—constitution, bill to amend, iii, 651—Conventions (see Conventions)—Evangelists, iii, 657—homestead law, iii, 655—Kasson Society, iii, 652—legislative hearing, iii, 651—petitions to Congress, iii, 651—property rights of married women, iii, 655—Rochester society, iii, 651—school officers, voting for, iii, 653—school suffrage, iii, 652—State association organized, iii, 657—teachers, iii, 660—temperance question, iii, 655.
Miner, Myrtilla, iii, 808.
Minor, Francis, resolutions St. Louis Convention, ii, 407, 717.
MINOR, Virginia L., Dahlgren's, Mrs., memorial, on, iii, 103—delegate to Nat. Democratic Convention, iii, 27—labors of, iii, 596—sanitary work, iii, 597—speeches: St. Louis Convention, ii, 409; Washington Convention, iii, 257—suit, ii, 715—Chief-Justice Waite's opinion, ii, 734—decision reviewed by Mrs. Gage, ii, 742—reviewed by *Central Law Journal*, ii, 748—taxes, refused to pay, iii, 607—vote, attempted to, iii, 606.
MISSISSIPPI, iii, 806.
MISSOURI, i, 194, 594—address to voters, iii, 599—Church and State, iii, 601—colleges and law schools, iii, 594—Conventions (see Conventions)—petition to Legislature, iii, 601—suffrage movement, facts and incidents, iii, 604—taxation, iii, 600—Woman Suffrage Association organized, iii, 599; division, iii, 603—woman's union, iii, 607—women in the war, iii, 596.
Mob Convention, Broadway Tabernacle, i, 546.
Mobs, i, 467.
Moody, W. W., iii, 662.
Morelli, Salvatore, iii, 898.
Morgan, E. D., i, 687.
Morgan, John T., on woman suffrage, iii, 210.
Morgan, Middie, live-stock reporter, iii, 403.
Morinella, Lucrezia, i, 29.
Mormonism, see *Polygamy*.
Morrill, Senator, on Sargent's amendment to Pembina Territory bill, ii, 562—speech on woman suffrage, ii, 118, 563.
Morris, Esther, made Justice of Peace, iii, 731.
Morris, W. H., iii, 691.

Digitized by Google

Morrow, Jane, sketch of i, 313.
Morton, O. P., iii, 114, 553—Pembina Territory bill, on the, ii, 549, 569, 571.
Moss, Charles E., speech, ii, 200.
"Mother Bickerdyke" iii, 709.
Mott, James, i, 69, 174, 438.
MOTT, Lucretia, ii, 177, 184; iii, 456—address at Westchester, Pa., Convention, i, 355—Bible, on the, i, 143—Bible, position of woman, on the, i, 380—Cleveland National Convention, at, i, 124—dangerous woman, spoken of as a, i, 423—divorce, on, i, 746—eulogy by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, i, 407—Farewell, last Convention, iii, 125—funeral, i, 835—Furness' church meeting, at, iii, 35—home of, i, 411—Howitt, William, correspondence, i, 434—letter to Lydia Mott, i, 746—letter to Josephine Griffing, ii, 873—letter to St. Louis Convention, iii, 144—letter to Salem; O., Convention, i, 812—letter to Saratoga Convention, i, 626—Luther's will, on, i, 359—marriage of, i, 408—marriage on, i, 79—Martineau, Harriet, correspondence, i, 437—memorial service, iii, 188—ministry, engaged in, i, 412—O'Connell, Daniel, correspondence, i, 432—portrait, i, 369—President of the American Equal Rights Association, made, ii, 174—President, meeting in Dr. Furness' church, iii, 35—President National Woman's Rights at Syracuse, made, i, 519—President Washington National Convention, made, ii, 346—Pulpit, on the, i, 73—recollections of, by Robert Collyer, i, 409, 414—religion and theology, on, i. 422—Rochester Convention, at, iii, 123—sketch of, i, 407—slavery, on, i, 416—speech at Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 557—Syracuse National Convention, argument, i, 527—tribute, Susan B. Anthony's, iii, 189—womanhood, her reply to R. H. Dana's lecture, i, 368.
Mott, Lydia, i, 376, 476, 519, 578, 593, 623, 744—letter Susan B. Anthony, i, 630; iii, 409.
Mott, Mary, letter to Westchester, Pa., Convention, i, 829.
Mottoes, Washington Convention, 1880, iii, 151—Newbury Society, Ohio, 502.
Moulton, Louise Chandler, i, 49.

N.

Nash, Clara H., iii, 358—admitted to the Bar, iii, 355.
Nash, Mary E., iii, 623.
National Association, officers 1886, iii, 956.
National Citizen, iii, 114, 116, 125.
Nations, mortality of, ii, 201.
Neal, Alice Bradley, i, 386.
Neal, John, ii, 435; iii, 352.
NEBRASKA, iii, 670—campaign, iii, 241—canvass of the State, iii, 686—Constitutional amendment, iii, 683; again defeated, 691; convention, 677; debate, 678; new constitution, 680—Conventions (see Conventions)—description of, iii, 671—electors, qualifications of, iii, 680—Fourteenth Amendment ratified, iii, 675—Frontier life, iii, 671—legislative action, iii, 672, 674, 675, 676, 683, 695—State, made a, iii, 675—suffrage societies, first, iii, 681—Thayer County Association, iii, 686—Woman Suffrage Amendment beaten at the polls, iii, 677—woman suffrage bill passed House, beaten in Senate, iii, 672—woman suffrage, first work in Lincoln, iii, 675—women, leading, iii, 692.
Negro, civil and political right of, argument, ii, 59.
Negroes opposed to woman suffrage in Kansas, ii, 232, 238.
Negro suffrage, ii, 103, 106.
Nevin, Dr., defence of the clergy, i, 140.
New England Convention, i, 262.
NEW HAMPSHIRE, iii, 367—married men, bill to protect, iii, 372—married women, Judicial decision, iii, 379—petitions, iii, 371—Republican Convention, iii, 373—State Association formed, iii, 370—woman suffrage, first organized action, iii, 367—women on school committees, iii, 374—women voting, iii, 376.
NEW JERSEY, i, 441; iii, 476—Conventions (see Conventions)—Constitution, defects in, i, 451—Historical Society, i, 447—legislative hearings, iii, 490—memorial to Legislature, iii, 480—mothers' legal claim to their children, iii, 483—property of married women, iii, 484—State Society, iii, 479—suffrage, progress made, iii, 479—Women's Club of Orange, iii, 482—Woman's Political Science Club, iii, 481—women in the pulpit, iii, 484—women as school trustees, iii, 484—woman suffrage, celebration of, ii, 846—woman suffrage, origin of, i, 447—women voted, iii, 476.
New Orleans Picayune, iii, 798.
Newspapers, women in, i, 43.
NEW YORK, i, 63, 472, iii, 395—appendix, iii, 959—Constitutional Convention, ii, 269, 282 — Constitutional revision commission, iii, 409—Conventions (see Conventions)—disfranchisement bill, Attorney-General Russell's opinion, iii, 434—Lansingburgh taxpayers, iii, 441—Legislative hearings, i, 464, 489, 605, 679, 745; iii, 406, 409, 417, 420; disfranchisement bill, iii, 426, 431, 434; reports on petitions, i, 612; report on woman suffrage, i, 629; school suffrage bill passed, iii, 424; suffrage, power to extend, iii, 959—License Law

Digitized by Google

of 1848, repeal, i, 474—property rights granted, iii, 438—reception at the capitol, iii, 438—results, iii, 443.
New York Christian Enquirer on the Worcester National Convention, i, 243.
New York Evening Express, ii, 95.
New York Evening Post, ii, 102.
New York Herald on Senator Wilson and woman suffrage, ii, 325.
New York Independent on the New York Constitutional Convention, ii, 305.
New York Times, i, 645, 648.
New York Tribune, ii, 101, 103, 304, 491, 820; iii, 46—support lost, ii, 269—World's Temperance Convention, on the, i, 511—woman as a voter, on the, ii, 248—Kansas campaign, on the, ii, 232.
Neyman, Clara, speech at Washington Convention, iii, 258.
Nichols, Elizabeth Pease, iii, 837, 925-6.
NICHOLS, Clarina I. Howard, iii, 704—Centennial protest, iii, 49—education of women, on, i, 356—Kansas campaign, ii, 258—letter to Rochester Temperance Convention, i, 847—portrait, i, 192—reminiscences, i, 171—speech at Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 561—Syracuse National Convention arguments, i, 522—tribute, iii, 764—work in Vermont, iii, 383.
Nicholson, Mrs. E. J., iii, 798.
Nightingale, Florence, ii, 14; iii, 854.
Nixon, Jennie C., iii, 798.
NORTH CAROLINA, iii, 825.
Northcote, Sir Stafford, iii, 873—speech on woman suffrage, iii, 887.
Norton, Caroline, i, 229.
Norway, iii, 912.
Nye, Joshua, iii, 359.

O.

Obituaries, ii, 905; iii, 891.
O'Connell, Daniel, letter to Lucretia Mott, i, 432.
O'Connor, Henry, iii, 617.
OHIO, i, 101; iii, 491—centennial celebration, women decline to take part, iii, 507—Constitutional Convention, iii, 565—Conventions (see Conventions)—Equal Rights Association, iii, 491—Painesville Equal Rights Society, iii, 509—Senate Committee report on the suffrage question, i, 870—Soldiers' Aid society, first, iii, 491—Toledo society, iii, 503, 506—women of Oberlin protest against enfranchisement, iii, 494.
Oliver, Anna, debate upon ordaining, i, 784—suit, iii, 440.
Oliver, Lewise, letters, iii, 40.
Omaha Republican, iii, 682—on Omaha Convention, iii, 251.
OREGON, iii, 767—clergy favor woman suffrage, iii, 778—constitutional amendment lost, iii, 778—Convention at Portland, iii, 773—Donation Land Act, iii, 770—legislative action, iii, 779—married woman's property bill, iii, 775—married woman's sole trader bill, iii, 771—school offices, women made eligible, iii, 775—suffrage organizations formed, iii, 774—suffrage society, first, iii, 768—Temperance Alliance, iii, 771—woman suffrage bill, iii, 771—woman suffrage bill passed Legislature, iii, 776.
Oren, Mrs. Sarah A., iii, 548, 972.
Organizations, Angelina G. Weld, on, i, 540.
Orth, Judge, votes woman suffrage in Congress, ii, 483—on national platform, iii, 225.
Orient, iii, 918.
Orme, Miss, iii, 928, 982.
Ostrander, Mrs. R., i, 180.
Otis, James, ii, 291, 644.
OWEN, Robert Dale, Women's Loyal League, ii, 50—"male" in Federal Constitution, ii, 91—birthday anniversary, 83rd, i, 619—Greeley discussion on divorce, i, 746—letter to Susan B. Anthony, i, 292—sketch of, by Rosamond Dale Owen, i, 293—speech at meeting in Philadelphia, ii, 817—speech, property rights of married women, i, 296—spiritualism, i, 301—testimonial, silver pitcher, i, 300.
Owen, Mrs. Robert Dale, i, 302, 313, (see Robinson, Mary).
Owen, Sarah C., letter to Emily Collins, i, 91—speech, i, 78.

P.

Pacific Northwest, iii, 767.
Paddock, A. S., iii, 674.
Painter, Hetty R., iii, 693.
Paist, Harriet W., iii, 467.
Pan-Presbyterians, i, 783.
Panim, Ivan, i, 773.
Parasol-makers, ii, 829.
Parker, Alex., speech at Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 560.
Parker, Julia Smith, argument before Senate Committee, iii, 156 (see Smith, Julia, and Abby).
Parker, Mary S., i, 39.
Parker Theodore, i, 626; ii, 207—sermon "Function of Woman," i, 277.
Parnell, Stewart, M. P., iii, 71.
Parnell, Rosina M., iii, 956.
Parody, woman suffrage in the courts, ii, 599.
"Pastoral Letter," i, 81, 84.
Pat and the Locomotive, ii, 188.
Patridge, Lelia E., ii, 852; iii, 461.
Patterson, Catherine G., iii, 712.
Patterson, Jessie, iii, 708.
Peckham, Lilia, career, iii, 642.
Peel, Sir Robert, iii, 835.

Digitized by Google

Pellet, Sarah, speech at Saratoga Convention, i, 621.
Pembina Territory bill, U. S. Senate debate on Sargent's amendment, ii, 545—bill rejected, ii, 582 (see also Congressional).
Penn, William, i, 320.
Pennell, Mrs. Horace, i, 92.
PENNSYLVANIA, i, 320; iii, 444—anti-slavery struggle, i, 323—appendix, iii, 961—Century Club, iii, 469—Citizens' Suffrage Association, iii, 460—common law, iii, 961—Constitutional Convention, iii, 495—Conventions (*see Convention*)s—Fugitive Slave law i, 328—hall, destruction of, i, 333—Legislature recommends a sixteenth amendment, iii, 474—literary women, iii, 469—medical school controversy, iii, 447—petitions to Legislature, iii, 463—property law, married women's, iii, 445—school officers, women elected, iii, 467—school offices, women made eligible, iii, 465—statutes and court decisions, iii, 963—suffrage association formed in Philadelphia, iii, 457—report, annual, iii, 459—Swarthmore college, iii, 456—temperance work in, i, 344—University, attempt to open to women, iii, 474—University, clinical instruction, iii, 448—Woman's Medical College, i, 389—Woman's Medical College, report on hospital clinics, iii, 450—woman's rights, first legal argument, iii, 462—women sold with cattle, iii, 445.
Perry, M. Frederica, lawyer, iii, 574.
Peru, iii, 6.
Peterson, Myra, iii, 703.
PETITION to Congress for a XVI. amendment, ii, 851—first, sent to New York Legislature, iii, 395—Sherman-Dahlgren against woman suffrage, ii, 494—Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 78.
Petitions, i, 262, 308, 315, 489, 588, 625, 629; ii, 91, 282, 283, 286, 401, 514, 516, 560, 698; iii, 58, 104, 790—form of, i, 676—New York Legislature report, i, 612; against, iii, 571, 841.
Petitioners, four classes of, ii, 283.
Phelps, Almira L., letter to Mrs. Hooker, iii, 100.
Phelps, Elizabeth B., woman's bureau, ii, 431.
Phelps, Elizabeth Stuart, ii, 831.
Philadelphia Press, ii, 359; iii, 44—*Ledger*, iii, 43.
Philadelphia Anti-Slavery Society, i, 325.
PHILLIPS, Wendell, ii, 317, 268; i, 469—Anti-Slavery Convention, London, i, 54—Grimké, Angelina, his opinion of, i, 399—Kansas campaign, ii, 230—last letter on woman suffrage, iii, 122—letter of regret, Saratoga Con., i, 627—letter to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 62—letter to Mrs. Stebbins, iii, 522—marriage and divorce, on, i, 732—Mrs. Eddy's will, iii, 312—self-government, on, i, 258—speeches: Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 572, 637; Cooper Institute Convention, i, 701; Mozart Hall Convention, i, 674; National Convention, Boston, ii, 178; New England Convention, i, 273; Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 84; Worcester, Mass., Convention, i, 227—treasurer of Jackson fund, i, 189—woman suffrage, apathy, ii, 318—World's Temperance Convention, at the, i, 152.
Philosophy, school of, at Concord, iii, 307.
Physical culture, ii, 908.
Physicians and nurses, iii, 298.
Pickler, J. A., letter to M. J. Gage, iii, 668.
Pierce, J. D., on woman suffrage, iii, 739.
Pierce, Wm. S., on woman suffrage, iii, 458.
Pierpont, Rev. John, iii, 294—speech at Broadway Tabernacle, i, 451, 569.
PILLSBURY, Parker. speeches, i, 427, 671; ii, 173, 176, 201, 375; iii, 173, 196, 275, 367, 478, 948—appeal for, universal suffrage, ii, 917—editor, *The Revolution*, ii, 264—Fifteenth Amendment, on the, ii, 265, 335, 337—Kansas campaign, ii, 265; iii, 367, 945.
Pitkin, Benjamin C., on woman's rights, i, 209.
Playfair, Lyon, iii, 850.
Plumb, P. B., the Kansas campaign, ii, 231, 253.
Plumly, Rush, i, 364.
Pochin, Henry D., iii, 847.
Pochin, Mrs., iii, 848, 929.
Poem, "Endurance," Lowell, iii, 695—Frances D. Gage and the Hutchinsons, iii, 38—"From Clatsop," iii, 780—"Pastoral Letter," i, 84—"Ancient Usage," i, 371—"The Times That Try Men's Souls," i, 82—"Woman's Cause," Lowell, i, 263—Tennyson's Princess, iii, 258.
POLAND, iii, 917.
Police, women as, iii, 397, 431, 432.
Political campaigns, Anna E. Dickinson, ii, 43.
Political disabilities, ii, 315.
Polygamy, i, 776, 777, 778—Miss Couzins on, iii, 223, 128, 130—Bishop Lunt's defense of, i, 776.
Pomeroy, C. R., letter to Des Moines Convention, iii, 618.
Pomeroy, Senator, S. C., i, 185—speeches, ii, 151, 324, 346, 419; iii, 727, 811.
Poppleton, A. J., speech at Omaha Convention, iii, 241.
Porter, Albert G., iii, 538, 553.
Portugal, iii, 901.

Digitized by Google

POST, Amy, i, 75—letter to Susan B. Anthony, iii, 48—Third Decade Meeting in Rochester, N. Y., iii, 117—tried to vote, ii, 647.
Potter, T. B., iii, 848.
Powell, Aaron M., i, 468, 671; ii, 783.
Pray, Isaac C., speech at Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 571.
Presidential campaigns: 1856, John C. Fremont, i, 633, 641, 643—1872, Grant and Wilson, ii, 217, 520—1876, Hayes and Tilden, iii, 22, 26, 415—1880, Garfield and Hancock, iii, 175, 187, 431.
Preston, Ann, i, 389, 390—address at Westchester, Pa., Convention, i, 360—Dean Medical College, iii, 450.
Pretorius, Emile, letter to Woman's Nat. Loyal League, ii, 86.
Price, Abby, speech at Syracuse National Convention, i, 532—Worcester Convention, i, 218, 242.
Priestley, celibacy, i, 759, 760.
Prince, Bradford L., iii, 417.
Privileges and immunities, ii, 453.
Progressive friends, i, 141.
Prohibition Convention, iii, 183.
Prohibitionists, alliance with, iii, 280.
Property Bill, i, 64—bill, New York, i, 256—laws, i, 171—rights, Wm. Hay's paper, i, 607—rights of married women, iii, 325—opinions of Indiana Legislators, i, 299.
Prostitution, i, 264; iii, 144, 397, 398 (see, also, Vice).
Pryor, Margaret, iii, 477.
Pugh, Sarah, i, 327, 337, 376—letter to Salem, O., Convention, i, 814; iii, 19, 34—at Third Decade Convention, iii, 125.
Pulpit, ii, 902—charges against, 135.
Pulte medical college, iii, 511.
Purvis, Robert, ii, 183, 265, 347, 358, 418; iii, 63, 72.

Q.

Quakers, i, 412, 783.
"Queen's women," i, 794.

R.

Ransier, A. J., ii, 542; iii, 829.
Raymond, Henry J., i, 547, 649.
Reconstruction, ii, 313.
Reed, C. A., iii, 768, 773.
Reed, Thomas B., in Congress, iii, 219, 366.
Reformation, i, 774.
Reid, Mrs. Hugo, iii, 836, 838.
REMINISCENCES: Collins, Emily, i, 88—Davis, Paulina W., by "E. C. S.," i, 283—Grimké, Angelina, by "E. C. S." i, 392—Nichols, Clarina I. H., i, 171—Stanton's, Elizabeth C., i, 456; iii, 922—Starrett, Helen E., ii, 250—Thomas, Mary F., i, 306—Way, Amanda, i, 306.
Remond, Charles L., i,, 214, 220, 225.
Republican Party, iii, 279.
Republicans, treachery of, ii, 322.
Reports (see Woman Suffrage).
Resolutions: i, 71, 219, 254, 535, 537, 542, 570, 574, 580, 593, 633, 641, 644, 646, 673, 694, 706, 708, 716, 723, 787, 808, 814, 816, 817, 820, 821, 823, 825, 827, 833, 834, 855;
ii, 57, 84, 154, 171, 190, 213, 358, 384, 388, 396, 407, 420, 436, 493, 521, 533, 537, 583, 584, 780, 809, 810, 818, 826, 837, 843, 859;
iii, 5, 19, 61, 69, 74, 124, 128, 152, 252, 256, 493, 566, 619, 641, 676, 707, 708, 780.
Retrospect, iii, 51.
Revelation, i, 647.
Revolution, 1776, i, 747—Arnett, Hannah, i, 441—battle, first, i, 203—girls, two, with a drum and fife, i, 204—spy, female, i, 323—women in the, i, 201, 321, 444.
Revolution, The, i, 46; ii, 317, 319, 321, 324, 333, 340, 344, 345, 372, 381, 382, 400, 401, 407, 411, 426, 431; iii, 397, 398, 478, 752, 802—editorial correspondence, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, ii, 362, 367—establishment of, iii, 401—founded, when, ii, 264.
RHODE ISLAND, iii, 339—Conventions (see Conventions)—legislation, iii, 346—State Association, organized, iii, 340, address, iii, 345; work done, iii, 343—women represented, iii, 349—Women's Board of Visitors, iii, 345—women on school boards, iii, 341.
Richards, David M., iii, 715, 716, 719, 721.
Richardson, Susan Hoxie, iii, 560.
Ricker, Marilla M., iii, 106—first woman to cast a vote, ii, 586—prison reform, on, iii, 578.
Riddle, Albert G., iii, 106—speech at Washington Convention, ii, 421—speech before Congressional Committee, ii, 448—Spencer-Webster suit, argument, ii, 587.
Roberts, Mrs. Marshall O., iii, 400.
Roberts, William H., iii, 777.
Robinson, Charles, i, 191.
Robinson, Emily, i, 103.
Robinson, Harriett Hanson, iii, 125, 196, 222, 227, 229, 265.
Robinson, Lelia J., application to the bar, iii, 307—Supreme Court decision, iii, 308.
Robinson, Lucius (Gov.), defeat of, iii, 423—vetoes school suffrage bill, iii, 418.
Robinson, Mary, sketch of, i, 293.
Rochester Democrat and Chronicle on Miss Anthony's trial, ii, 715.
Rochester Evening Express on Miss Anthony's trial, ii, 714.

Digitized by Google

Rocky Mountain News, iii, 715.
Roebling, Mrs., iii, 440.
Roebuck's flattery of woman, i, 537.
Rogers, Nathaniel P., i, 61, iii, 367.
Roland, Pauline, i, 234.
Rome, "The City of God," i, 794.
Root, H. K., speech at Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 560.
Root J. P., on the Kansas campaign, ii, 258.
ROSE, Ernestine L., i, 38, 52, 619, 624, 626, 636; ii, 399; iii, 514—biography, i, 95—debate, Cleveland National Convention, i, 133—English women, on, i, 645—Equal Rights Association, on the, ii, 397—*Letters:* to Susan B. Anthony, i, 99, iii, 50; to Mrs. J. F. Griffing, ii, 356; to Rochester Convention, iii, 120—marriage, on, i, 237—marriage and divorce, on, i, 729—portrait of, i, 97—propagandist, *Albany Register* charges, i, 608—resolutions, i, 707—*Speeches:* Broadway Tabernacle, i, 562, 661; Cooper Institute Covention, i, 692; New York Legislature, i, 607; Philadelphia Convention, i, 376; Rochester Convention, i, 579; Syracuse Convention, i, 537; Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 60, 64, 73; Worcester Convention, i, 237—tribute to Frances Wright, i, 692—Westchester, Pa., Convention, at, i, 357—women in colleges, on, i, 144; ii, 208—in London, 1883, iii, 940.
Ross, E. G., letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 423.
Ross, James, i, 449.
Ross, Laura J., ii, 374; (see Wolcott, Laura Ross).
Russell, Leslie W., iii, 434—defeat of, iii, 437.
Russell, Lucinda, correspondence, iii, 682—sketch of, iii, 692.
Russia, iii, 915.

S.

Sacrilegious child, Cardinal Antonelli's, i, 788.
Safe deposit companies, iii, 402.
St. Chrysostom's description of woman, i, 758.
St. John, Gov., J. P., ii, 258. iii, 706.
St. Paul, quotations, iii, 720.
Salic law, i, 774.
Sanborn, Frank B., ii, 765.
Sandford, Arch-Deacon, iii, 848.
Sanford, Rebecca M., i, 77—letter to Cleveland Convention, i, 819.
Sandige, John M., iii, 791.
Sanitary Commission, ii, 13.
SARGENT, A. A., iii, 108—California Constitution, on the, iii, 760—District of Columbia suffrage bill, on the, ii, 483 letter to Omaha Convention, iii, 245—letter to Rochester Convention, iii, 121—Pembina Territory bill, amendment, ii, 545; bill rejected, ii, 582—Pembina Territory bill, on the, ii, 546, 555, 564, 567—resolution, woman suffrage, iii, 70—speech in San Francisco, on woman's rights, ii, 483—speech in Senate, iii, 9—woman suffrage, joint resolution, iii, 75—minister at Berlin, iii, 944.
Sargent, Elizabeth, M. D., iii, 763.
Sargent, J. T., letter to Mrs. E. C. Stanton, ii, 911—speech at New England Convention, i, 270.
Saunders, Alvin, on woman suffrage, iii, 226, 674.
Savage, John, i, 38.
Saxe, Dana, and Grace Greenwood, i, 828.
Saxon Elizabeth L., iii, 180, 197, 241, 690, 791—argument before Senate committee, iii, 157.
Scatcherd, Mrs. Oliver, iii, 875, 878, 923, 629, 936.
Schell, Augustus, favors woman suffrage, iii, 422.
Schenck, Elizabeth T., iii, 750, 754.
School of Design for Women, i, 390; iii, 399.
School officirs, bill passed New York Legislature, iii, 417; vetoed by Gov. Robinson, iii, 418.
School suffrage (see Suffrage Gained).
Schurz, Carl, i, 42; ii, 370; iii, 46.
SCOTLAND (see Great Britain, iii, 833).
Scott, Thomas A., ii, 5.
Scovill, James M., ii, 420; iii, 477.
Sears, Judge, in Kansas campaign, ii, 240, 253.
See, Rev. Isaac M., trial of, i, 780; iii, 485.
Segur, Rose L., iii, 103.
Selden, H. R., Miss Anthony's counsel, ii, 629, 647, 652, 654, 679, 680, 689; appeal to Congress, 698.
Seneca Falls Convention, i, 67.
Severance, Caroline M., address at Broadway Tabernacle, i, 569—New England Convention, i, 262—letter to Mrs. E.C. Stanton, ii, 911.
Sewall, Samuel E., iii, 269.
Seward, Wm. H., on self-government, ii, 76, 77; iii, 85—on woman's rights, i, 457.
Sewall, May Wright, iii, 226, 534, 557, 259.
Seymour, Horatio, thirty pieces of silver, i, 473.
Shattuck, Harriette R., iii, 226, 257.
Shaw, Sarah B., letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 239.
Shelly, Kate, heroism of, iii, 633.
Sherman-Dahlgren petition against woman suffrage, ii, 494.
Shields, M. F., iii, 719.
Sholes, C. L., report on rights of women in Wisconsin, i, 315; iii, 640.

Digitized by Google

Shuman, Andrew, iii, 561.
Silk Culture, iii, 762.
Simpson, Bishop, favors woman suffrage, iii, 460, 616.
Sixteenth Amendment, ii, 333, 350, 351, 352, 353, 400, 420, 422, 425, 436; iii, 112.
Sixteenth Amendment, reasons for a, iii, 235.
Sixteenth Amendment, renewed appeal, iii, 58—press comments, iii, 67.
Sketches, *see Biography.*
Slave law, fugitive, Pennsylvania, i, 328.
Slavery, Angelina Grimké's speech, i, 334 (see, also, Anti-Slavery).
Slavery sustained by the North, ii, 542.
Slavery and the war, ii, 77.
Slavonic countries, iii, 915.
Smith, Elizabeth Oakes, iii, 117, 128, 328, 826—Massachusetts Constitutional Convention, at the, i, 253—speech at Syracuse Convention, i, 522 — Worcester Convention, at, i, 231.
SMITH Gerrit, home of, i, 471—letter to Susan B. Anthony, i, 497; ii, 317, 538, 941; Wm. Lloyd Garrison, i, 223, 620; St. Louis Convention, ii, 825; Elizabeth Cady Stanton, i, 708, 836—speech at Syracuse National Convention, i, 526—petition for woman suffrage, refused to sign, ii, 317.
Smith, Mrs. Gerrit, petition, ii, 98.
Smith, Hannah Whitehall, speech at Philadelphia Convention, iii, 230.
Smith, Julia and Abby, iii, 76, 98, 328, 336.
Smith, Sidney, iii, 834.
Snow, Lucy and Lavinia, iii, 365.
Social relations, Channing's report, i, 233.
Sojourner Truth, i, 115, 567; ii, 193, 222, 224, 926; iii, 458, 531.
Soldiers, women as, ii, 18, 869.
Somerville, Mary, i, 790—letter to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 440.
Song, "A Hundred Years Hence," iii, 38.
Song, "Kansas Suffrage," ii, 934.
Sorosis, iii, 402, 571.
South, what the, can do, ii, 929.
SOUTH CAROLINA, iii, 828.
Southwick, Thankful, i, 341.
Southworth, Mrs. E. D. E. N., iii, 813.
SPAIN, iii, 901.
Spencer, Herbert. i, 26.
SPENCER, Sarah Andrews, iii, 35, 66, 97, 103—argument before House Committee, iii, 166—before Senate Judiciary Committee, ii, 543 — before D. C. Committee, iii, 12—delegate Rep. Nat. Convention, iii, 26—resolutions, iii, 152—speeches, ii, 539—suit, ii, 587—Chief-Justice Cartter's opinion, ii, 597.
Spider-crab, Theodore Tilton, ii, 93.
Sprague, Homer B., ii, 425.
Stanford, Leland, iii, 764.
Stansfeld, M. P., James, iii, 872—speech, iii, 886.
Stanton, Edwin M., and Mrs. J. S. Griffing, ii, 33.
STANTON, Elizabeth Cady, i, 61, 67, 79; ii, 322, 360, 361, 381, 382, 383, 391, 417, 418, 428, 430, 456, 582; iii, 7, 35, 40, 195, 222, 529, 560, 630, 644, 811—Abolitionists, and the, ii, 264—address to New York Legislature, i, 595—appeal to women of New York State, i, 676—appeal to women of the Republic, ii, 51—appeal for Woman's Rights, i, 858—argument before Senate committee, iii, 228—"Bloomer," in a, i, 128—California visit, iii, 756—call, loyal women, ii, 53—candidate for Congress, ii, 180—children i, 457—civil rights bill for women, ii, 541—"copperheads," ii, 320—divorce for drunkenness, argument, i, 485—editorial correspondence in *The Revolution*, ii, 362, 367—eulogy: Lucretia Mott, i, 407—Equal Rights Association, ii, 173, 174—eternal punishment, on, iii, 196—Fifteenth Amendment, on the, ii, 333—girls and boys at school, on, ii, 541—Grant and Wilson campaign, in, ii, 520—Greeley, Horace, and, ii, 287—Hurlbut, Judge, i, 39—Kansas campaign, i, 200; ii, 253, 254, 261, 262, 263—lecture, "Education of Girls," iii, 536—lectures in Omaha, iii, 675—lecturing tour, Ohio, iii, 491—Letters: to Akron, O., Convention, i, 815; to *The Ballot Box*, iii, 64; to Cooper Institute Convention, i, 860; to Gerrit Smith, i, 839; to Gen. Hawley, iii, 28; to Horace Greeley, i, 735; to the *National Citizen*, iii, 147; to Omaha convention, iii, 244; to Salem, O., convention, i, 810; to Syracuse convention i, 848; to Washington convention, iii, 261 — London visit, 1882-3, iii, 922—"male" in the constitution, on the word, ii, 91—manhood suffrage, on, iii, 566—marriage and divorce, on, i, 716, 738—Michigan campaign iii, 521—"Negro's hour," ii, 94—Newport Con., ii, 403—Oregon, Mo., visit, iii, 609—portrait, i, 721—President Albany convention, i, 592—President Loyal League, made, ii, 66—press comments on Rochester and Seneca Falls conventions, her reply to, i, 806—reception, Sorosis, Chicago, iii, 571—reconstruction, on, ii, 214—Reminiscences: i, 456, 836; iii, 922; of Angelina Grimké, i, 392; of Paulina Wright Davis, i, 283—resolutions before Congress affecting women, on, ii, 92—resolutions, Washington convention, ii, 542—sermon, St. Louis, iii, 148—Sixteenth Amendment, urges a, ii, 350—Smith, Gerrit, refusing to sign petition for

Digitized by Google

woman suffrage, on, ii, 317—Speeches: Cooper Institute, i, 716; Congressional committee, before, ii, 411; Furness' Church, in, iii, 35; Legislature, claiming woman's rights, ii, 271; Milwaukee, iii, 641; National protection for National citizens, iii, 80; New York Legislature, i, 679; New York National convention, ii, 154; Rochester Convention, iii, 117; Rochester Temperance Convention, i, 481, 493; Senate Judiciary Committee, before, ii, 506; suffrage, question of, ii, 185; Washington Convention, ii, 495; Washington Nat. Convention, ii, 348; Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 87—testimonial ii, 533—Train, G. F., and *The Revolution*, criticism, ii, 264—tribute from *Leavenworth Commercial* (Kansas), ii, 263—view of, an objective, i, 456—Wadleigh, Senator, on, iii, 93—western trip, ii, 367—Wyoming visit, iii, 734.

Stanton Harriot, letter to Nebraska voters, iii, 247, 933.

Stanton, Theodore, iii, 262, 895, 928.

Starrett, Helen Ekin, reminiscences Kansas campaign, ii, 250, 348.

Stearns, O. P., iii, 528.

Stearns, Sarah Burger, iii, 527, 649.

Stebbins, Catharine A. F., ii, 26, 514—before House committee, iii, 162—letter to Lucretia Mott, iii, 47—vote, attempts to, iii, 523.

Steck, Amos, iii, 714.

Steele, William, iii, 319.

Stephens, Alexander H., reception, iii, 98, 830.

Stevens, Louisa B., iii, 633.

Stevens, Thaddeus, ii, 354, 632.

Stevenson, Emily Pitts, iii, 752.

Stevenson, Sarah Hackett, iii, 579.

Stewart's Home for Working Women, iii, 420.

Stewart, Senator, on the Pembina Territory bill, ii, 548, 558, 559, 564, 573, 579.

Stone, Dr. James A. B., address at St. Louis, ii, 821; iii, 525.

STONE, Lucy, i, 473, 619, 626; ii, 56; iii, 268, 279, 513, 722, 724, 818—Constitutional Convention at Albany, ii, 284—husband, and her, i, 164—husband's name, refusing to take her, i, 261—Kansas, in, i, 200—Kansas campaign, in, ii, 232—letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 237, 919—letter to Salem, O., Convention, i, 813—letters to E. Cady Stanton, ii, 234—letter to *The Una*, i, 501—marriage of, under protest, i, 260—meetings held in New Jersey, iii, 479—petitions, iii, 104—National Convention, Broadway Tabernacle, i, 631—Philadelphia National Convention, at, i, 375—portrait, ii, 761—report, American Woman Suffrage Association, ii, 803—scripture, on, i, 650—speeches: Broadway Tabernacle Convention, i, 554, 565, 632; American Woman Suffrage Association meeting in Cooper Institute, ii, 829; in Steinway Hall, ii, 811; in Detroit, ii, 837; in St. Louis, ii, 823, 827; in Washington, ii, 858; Cincinnati; i, 165; Cleveland, i, 163; Concord, iii, 271; Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 64; Worcester, i, 233—suffrage, negro, first, on, ii, 383—Syracuse National Convention, i, 524—taxes, refused to pay, i, 450.

Story, Judge, on the Constitution, ii, 477, 478, 588.

Strahan, Robert H., iii, 417.

Strong, Rev. A. H., iii, 155—on subordination of women, i, 787.

Stuart, Abby H. H., iii, 787.

Stuart, Mary A., iii, 158, 817.

Studwell, Edwin A., ii, 398.

SUFFRAGE GAINED: *Full* suffrage, Isle of Man, iii, 870, 982; Utah Territory, ii, 426, 432; Washington Territory, iii, 777; Wyoming Territory, ii, 426, 432; iii, 730.

SUFFRAGE GAINED: *Municipal* suffrage: Canada, iii, 832, England, iii, 845; Madras, iii, 983; Scotland, iii, 871, 983.

SUFFRAGE GAINED; *School* suffrage: Canada, iii, 831; Colorado, iii, 718; Dakota, iii, 633; England, iii, 850; Kansas, i, 185, iii, 701, 710; Kentucky, i, 869, iii, 821; Massachusetts, iii, 288; Michigan, iii, 515, 530; Minnesota, iii, 652, 653, 654; Nebraska, iii, 675; New Hampshire, iii, 375, 376; New York, iii, 424; Oregon, iii, 775; Scotland, iii, 851; Vermont, i, 171, iii, 304.

Suits (see Trials).

SUMNER, Charles, ii, 35, 81, 168, 169—ballot, on the, ii, 95—equal rights to all, ii, 322—Fourteenth Amendment, opposed, ii, 323—voted for, ii, 324—letter, Woman's National Loyal League anniversary, ii, 86—"male," and the word, ii, 91—petition, presents, under protest, ii, 96—petitions, asks for, ii, 93—rebuked by Senator Cowan, ii, 113—speech in U. S. Senate on presentation of petition of the Woman's Nat. League, ii, 78—Taxation without Representation, on, ii, 114.

Sunday-school teachings, i, 786.

Sunderland-Gage controversy, i, 543.

Sunderland, Mrs. H. E., iii, 564.

Sutherland, Julia K., iii, 6.

Swank, Emma B., i, 307—sketch of, i, 313.

Sweet, Ada, pension agent, iii, 6.

Swisshelm, Jane Grey, i, 386; iii, 650, 813—*Saturday Visitor*, i, 46—letter, "Borders of Monkeydom," i, 807—speech, Washington Convention, iii, 61.

SWITZERLAND, iii, 909, 911.

Digitized by Google

T.

Taney, Justice, ii, 639.
Tax, society, anti, iii, 413—Susan A. King, iii, 420—protest, Harriet K. Hunt's, i, 259—Report of N. Y. State Assessors, iii, 412 — representation, without, ii, 114, 169, 274, 475; iii, 289, 397—Lucy Stone refused to pay, i, 450.
Taylor, Helen, ii, 425; iii, 852, 923, 940.
Taylor, Mrs. Mentia, letter to Mrs. P. W. Davis, ii, 438—Mrs. P. A., iii, 848.
Taylor, R. B., in Kansas campaign, ii, 231.
Tea, Anti, Leagues, i, 202.
Telegrapher, Hattie Hutchinson, age ten years, iii, 805.
Teller, Willard, iii, 715.
TEMPERANCE conventions: Albany, i, 489 — Dayton, Ohio, i, 118 — Half World's, i, 506—Lawrence, Kansas, ii, 231—Pennsylvania, i, 348—World's, i, 152—press comments, i, 854—daughters of, i, 474—New York, Brick Church meeting, i, 499—New York, Metropolitan Hall meeting, i, 490—New York Woman's State Society, i, 484—Woman Suffrage, and, ii, 819.
TENNESSEE, iii, 822.
Tennessee campaign, Miss Carroll, ii, 3-9.
Tenney, Mrs. R. S., letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 257.
TEXAS, iii, 801—Constitutional Convention, iii, 801—Legislative action, iii, 802—women in government offices, iii, 804.
Theological discussion, i, 647.
Thirteenth Amendment, ii, 77, 313, 663.
Thomas', Mrs. Abel C., farm, iii, 469.
Thomas, Julia J., and Greek prize, iii, 6.
Thomas, Mary F., ii, 860—reminiscences of, i, 306—sketch of, i, 314—speech, Winchester, Ind., convention, i, 308.
Thompson, Geo., speech, i, 56.
Thompson, Mary A., iii, 97, 775.
Thomson, J. Edgar, will of, iii, 468.
Thornton, J. Quinn, iii, 773.
Tilden, Samuel J., i, 473; iii, 417.
Tillotson, Mary A., iii, 103.
TILTON, Theodore, ii, 117, 376—Beecher colloquy, ii, 167—Fifteenth Amendment, and the, ii, 327—Kansas campaign, ii, 230 — letter to American Woman Suffrage Association, ii, 770—speech at Nat. Convention in New York, ii, 154.
Tod, Isabella M., iii, 866, 888, 938.
Toucey, Sinclair, ii, 419.
Train, Geo. Francis, ii, 381, 431—Constitutional Convention at Albany, before, ii, 284—Kansas campaign, in, ii, 243, 254, 264.
Tracts, prize, i, 379.
TRIALS and Decisions, ii, 586, 934—Allen, Jane, case of, ii, 592—Anthony, Susan B. (see Anthony)—Bly, Mrs., ii, 671—Bradwell, Myra (see Bradwell)—Burnham, Carrie, suit, ii, 600—Gardner, Nannette B., ii, 587—Huntington, Sarah M. T., ii, 628—Inspectors of election, ii, 691—jury convicts, ii, 696—pardoned by President Grant, ii, 715—sentenced, ii, 698—trial, motion for new, ii, 696—Mansfield, Arabella A., case of, ii, 606—Minor, Virginia L., ii, 715—Chief-Justice Waite's opinion, ii, 734—opinion reviewed by Mrs. Gage, ii, 742—reviewed by *Central Law Journal*, ii, 748—parody, ii, 599—Ricker, Mrs. M. M., ii, 586—Spencer, Sarah Andrews, suit, ii, 587—Chief-Justice Cartter's opinion, ii, 597—Van Valkenburg, Ellen Rand, suit, ii, 600—Waite, Catharine V., suit, ii, 601; iii, 571—Webster, Sarah E., ii, 587; iii, 571—5,000 women householders and Lord Coleridge, iii, 884.
Truman, James, on Women in dentistry, iii, 452.
Trumbull, Lyman, ii, 498.
Tudor, Mrs. Fenno, reception, iii, 197.
TURKEY, iii, 919.
Turner, Eliza Sproat, iii, 451.
Turner, Jennie, iii, 407.
Tyler, Moses Coit, ii, 813.
Tyler, W. S., iii, 497.
Tyndale, Sarah, tribute, i, 218.
Tyndale, Sharon, ii, 371.

U.

UNA, Mrs. Paulina Wright Davis, i, 46, 246.
Uncle Tom's Cabin, i, 102.
Underhill, Sarah E., i, 308—sketch of, i, 313.
United States a nation? Is the, ii, 529.
Updegraff, W. W., Kansas campaign, ii, 250.
Upham, Hon. Charles W., i, 210.
Underwood, John C., iii, 823—tribute, ii, 538, 640.
UTAH, ii, 325.

V.

Van Cleve, Charlotte O., iii, 653.
Van Lew, Elizabeth, postmaster at Richmond, iii, 824.
Van Pelt, Maggie, journalist, iii, 629.
Van Valkenburg, Ellen Rand, ii, 600.
Van Voorhis, John, ii, 692-697.
Vassar College, iii, 398.
Vaughan, Mary C., speech on temperance, i, 476.
VERMONT, i, 171; iii, 383—homestead law, i, 172—St. Andrew's letter, iii, 384, 389—school suffrage, iii, 393—University opens to women, iii, 389—woman suffrage amendment, Reed's report, iii, 385—*Vermont Watchman*, iii, 386.

Digitized by Google

Vest, Senator, on woman suffrage, iii, 199, 203.
Vice, legalization of, i, 795, 796; iii, 145, 397.
Vicksburg, naval attack on, ii, 11.
VIRGINIA, iii, 823—Woman Suffrage Association, iii, 823.
Voltaire, i, 658.
Voris, A. C., ii, 837.
Vote, first woman to cast a, ii, 586—first woman to claim the right, iii, 815—Mrs. Gage attempted to, iii, 406—woman earned her right to, ii, 89—in Scotland, iii, 871—reports of voting in New York, iii, 429—voted with Miss Anthony, list of, ii, 647—voted in New Jersey, i, 448; iii, 476—voting in 1776, i, 33— persons entitled to, ii, 272.
Voted, 1867, Lily Maxwell, iii, 981.
Voters, qualification of, T. W. Higginson's speech, i, 249.

W.

Wade, Benjamin, F., ii, 9—letter to Susan B. Anthony, ii, 117; J. S. Griffing, ii, 34—speech, ii, 123—remarks to Anna Ella Carroll, ii, 9—letters to Miss Carroll, ii, 866, 867.
Wadsworth, L. A., iii, 352.
Wait, Anna C., iii, 696, 709.
Waite, Catharine V., ii, 601; iii, 571.
Waite, Chas. B., iii, 569.
Waite, Jessie T., argument before House committee, iii, 161—report of National Convention, iii, 254-260.
Waite, M. R., iii, 505—Supreme Court opinion, ii, 734-742.
Waldo, Peter, ii, 27.
Walker, Dr. Mary, ii, 20, 813; iii, 103.
Wall, Sarah E., ii, 636; iii, 310.
Wallace, W. D., iii, 540, 966.
Wallace, Zerelda G., iii, 536-7, 539-40, 551—argument before Senate com., iii, 155—letter to S. B. Anthony, iii, 257.
Walling, Mrs. M. C., speech in U. S. Senate, ii, 327.
Walter, Cornelia, iii, 303.
War, woman's patriotism in, ii, 1, 863; iii, 596, 631.
Warn Kate, iii, 398.
Warner, Esther L., iii, 693.
Warren, Mercy, Otis, i, 31; ii, 201.
Washington Conventions (see Conventions)—(see also District of Columbia).
Washington Evening Star, iii, 97.
Washington Sunday Chronicle, ii, 599.
Washington, George, letter to ladies of Trenton, N. J., i, 447.
WASHINGTON Territory, iii, 786—women enfranchised, iii, 776.
Watterson, Henry, ii, 861, 862; iii, 182.
Wattles, John O., i, 189.
Wattles, Susan E., ii, 255; iii, 697.
Way, Amanda M., iii, 533—legislative hearing, iii, 539—reminiscences, i, 306—sketch of, i, 311.
Weber, Helene Marie, i, 41—letter to M. A. Spofford, i, 825.
Webster, Rev. D. L., i, 114.
Webster, Sarah E., suit, ii, 587—Chief-Justice Cartter's opinion, ii, 597.
Weed, Thurlow, i, 720.
Weld, Angelina Grimké, on organizations, i, 540—speech, Loyal Women's Convention, ii, 54—speech, Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 60; iii, 282.
Weld, Theodore, i, 392.
Wells, Charlotte Fowler, i, 45; ii, 435.
Wendt, Mathilda F., iii, 405.
Wendte, W. C., ii, 855.
Wenthworth, Elizabeth R., iii, 643.
Wesley, John, on witchcraft, i, 765.
Wesley, Susannah, i, 790.
Weston, Hannah and Rebecca, i, 203.
WEST VIRGINIA, iii, 824.
Wheatly, Phillis, colored, i, 205.
Wheeler, L. May, iii, 659.
Whipple, E. P., views of George Eliot, i, 791.
White Andrew D., iii, 398, 528.
White, Bessie Heagen, pharmacy, iii, 820.
White, Laura R., architect, iii, 820.
White, Richard Grant, on the word "citizen," ii, 567.
Whitehead, Wm. A., paper on woman suffrage, i, 447.
Whiting Lilian, iii, 303.
Whiting, N. H., i, 861.
Whitman, Sarah Helen, ii, 433.
Whittier, John G., i, 83; iii, 520.
Wife ownership, i, 772.
Wigham, Eliza, iii, 852.
WILBOUR, Charlotte B., iii, 396—organized Sorosis, iii, 403—President New York City Society, iii, 405—remarks at Washington Convention, ii, 421, 424—Corresponding Secretary Loyal League, ii, 80.
Wilbur, Hervey Backus, iii, 421.
Wilcox, Hamilton, ii, 346; iii, 441, 959.
Wildman, John R., iii, 457.
Willard, Emma, i, 36. [660.
Willard, Frances E., iii, 104, 578, 587.
Willard, Judge John, i, 750.
Will of Bridget Smith, i, 563.
Williams, George, iii, 774.
Williams, Nellie, i, 48.
Williams, Sarah Langdon, iii, 503—*The Ballot-Box*, iii, 51.
Williams, Senator, ii, 108.
Willing, Mrs. J. F., ii, 368.
Willis (see Olympia Brown).
Wilson, Elizabeth, i, 103.
Wilson, Hannah, iii, 697.
Wilson, Henry, ii, 113, 128, 322, 390; iii, 267.
Winchell, Charlotte, S., career of, iii, 653.
WISCONSIN, i, 178, 290; iii, 638—Con-

Digitized by Google

ventions (see Conventions)—legislation, iii, 638—Shole's report, i, 315—report of David Noggle, i, 867—married women, rights of, iii, 638—Milwaukee Female College, iii, 643—State Association, iii, 645—State University, iii, 643—statutes, modification of, iii, 639—suffrage amendment, iii, 644—temperance question, iii, 645—women as lawyers, iii, 648—voters, iii, 640.
Wise, Mary E., ii, 869.
Witchcraft, i, 759, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769.
Wives in Russia, i, 773.
Wives, sale of, i, 792.
Wizards, i, 766.
Wolcott, Laura Ross, graduated medical college i, 389—organized Wisconsin State Society, ii, 374—sketch of, iii, 638—National Convention, Milwaukee, iii, 184.
Wollstonecraft, Mary, eulogy of, i, 126-7—"Rights of Women," i, 34.
Wollstenholme, Mrs. Almy, with Mrs. Jacob Bright, iii, 893.
WOMAN, advice of men, warned against, ii, 268--Anglo-Saxon laws, i, 863--army, in the, i, 290—bar, admissions to, iii, 307, 355—British Parliament, in, i, 30—census enumerators, first appointments, iii, 174—church poll, at the, i, 781—civil service, in, iii, 306—clinical instruction, Pennsylvania University, iii, 448—co-education, statistics, iii, 496—colleges, and the, ii, 541—colleges, in, i, 144, iii, 6—college in Evanston, Illinois, iii, 578—congress organized in New York, iii, 411—degradation of, i, 791, 794——emancipation, i, 29—employment of, in insane asylums, iii, 421—employments, varied capacity for, iii, 406, 572—excluded as delegates, Anti-slavery Convention, London, i, 60—chronological table of successive steps in England, iii, 980—history of, in three pictures; under Hindoo laws, i, 863; under Anglo-Saxon laws, i, 863, 864; under Signs of the Times, i, 865, 866—illiteracy of, iii, 372—inventions by, iii, 632—jury, on, iii, 731; list of the first grand, iii, 738—Kansas, of, i, 642—labor performed in Christian countries, i, 792—laborer, unpaid, i, 28—legal disabilities, removed of, iii, 893—legal rights, i, 107—list of names of friends in California, iii, 977-80; list of names of friends in Minnesota, iii, 973-80—Loyal League, ii, 3; address to Abraham Lincoln, ii, 67; anniversary of, ii, 80; letters in response to a call for a meeting, ii, 875; petition, ii, 78; platform, ii, 891; press comments, ii, 893; resolutions, ii, 84; secretary's report, ii, 80—married, act relative to rights of, i, 618—married, laws regarding, iii, 291—married, and their legal status, ii, 642—married, property rights of, iii, 325—marry, will the coming, iii, 723—national protection, claim, ii, 531—naval heroines, ii, 21—official position, first appointed to, in New York, iii, 417—Ohio, protest against enfranchisement, iii, 494—outrages, 1880, in Ireland, i, 794—pharmacy, 379, 820, 980—physician, first, i, 260—physicians in insane asylums, as, iii, 473—politics, in, ii, 277, 304—preachers, as, i, 784—professions, in the, iii, 706—property rights, i, 38, 64, 146, 256, 296, 770—property rights granted, iii, 438—public affairs, why meddle in, i, 109—revolution, in the, i, 31, 201, 321, 444—Roman law, under i, 754—school of design, Philadelphia, i, 390—school boards, on, iii, 892, 981—school officers, bill passed New York Legislature, iii, 417; vetoed by Gov. Robinson, iii, 418—school officers, made so in Illinois, iii, 575—science and literature, degraded in, i, 790—sermon to, Rev. Knox Little's, i, 782—Sin, Original, i, 756—slaves, legislated for as, i, 772—social evolution of, iii, 226—social relations, i, 233—sold with cattle in Pennsylvania, iii, 445—soldiers, as, ii, 18, 889—sphere, i, 76, 93, 148, 265, 317, 522, 660, 662, 694, 713, 716; ii, 62, 163, 779—spy, anecdote, i, 323—subordination, i, 780; Evarts in the Beecher-Tilton trial upon, i, 789; sermon by Rev. A. H. Strong, i, 787—Supreme Court opened to, iii, 138; Senator Hoar's speech, iii, 139—torture of, i, 26, 766, 768—type-setters, i, 585—wardens, iii, 893—work, statistics, i, 267—work done by,, iii, 54—work and wages, i, 78, 589—working, of Boston, ii, 389—working, seats in shops, iii, 433.
WOMAN SUFFRAGE, (see Suffrage Gained); appeals, i, 588, 856, 858; ii, 168, 247, 364—arguments in favor of, ii, 349—Bible argument, ii, 374; Bible, and the, i, 380, 535—complaints, 1869, the, ii, 323—debate between Anna Dickinson and R. L. Collier, iii, 567—Democratic National Convention, letters and delegates, iii, 22—discussion at Woman's National Loyal League, ii, 59—England, Gen. Butler's report in, ii, 465, 466, 467—essay, in *Westminster Review*, i, 225—Equal Rights Association organized, ii, 173—Fifth Avenue conference, ii, 427—Kansas, report of Judiciary Franchise Committee, i, 194—*National* Association organized, ii, 400; address to President Hayes, iii, 129; appeal, Mrs. Hooker's, to women of the United

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google